A RHETORICAL STUDY OF CERTAIN PAULINE ADDRESSES

By

Desmond Ford

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Speech

1960

ABSTRACT

A RHETORICAL STUDY OF CERTAIN PAULINE ADDRESSES

by Desmond Ford

This study examines seven typical discourses of the Apostle Paul--namely 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and Philemon. As addresses conceived to meet emergency situations, and being originally read aloud to Christian congregations as public speeches, these epistles are rhetorical rather than literary in nature, and have been analyzed as such according to the appropriate classical canons.

Chapters one and two sketch time-and-place factors, with special emphasis upon the main currents of first century thought in the realms of government, philosophy, ethics, religion, and education. In the third and fourth chapters, the life and influence of the Apostle are reviewed; and specific attention is paid to the factors which shaped Pauline oratory. The analyses of the discourses according to standard criteria of invention and arrangement constitute chapter five, while consideration of Paul's style is reserved for the chapter which then follows. Because a primary objective of the investigation has been to evaluate Paul's manifestation of ethos, and to compare it with the ethos recommended by recent homiletic theory, an entire chapter, the seventh, has been devoted to this phase of the study. Chapter eight is an inquiry into the relevance of Paul's ethical values for modern communication, and the concluding chapter summarizes the foregoing and evaluates Paul's contribution to rhetoric.

The analyses revealed that while Paul was too much of an individualist to conform in every way to the patterns of presentation recommended by the classical rhetoricians, on the whole his discourses do exemplify the chief requirements of Attic oratory. The epistles show the Apostle to have been resourceful in invention, with the evidences of his logical and psychological powers manifest in each address. It is, however, in his revelation of ethos that we find Paul's distinguishing characteristic. He ever conveyed himself, not ideas merely. Probably no other discourses of antiquity or modern times are so reflective of the competence, virtue, and affections of the orator concerned as the Pauline epistles. The Apostle thus exemplifies both the modern homiletic stress on the preacher's incarnation of truth, and Quintilian's conception of the "good" orator. It is in this exemplification of the ancient classical dictum and the modern homiletic concept that the Apostle's chief contribution to rhetoric consists. He reminds us anew that "as a rule we trust men of probity more, and more quickly, about things in general, while on points outside the realm of exact knowledge, where opinion is divided, we trust them absolutely."

The consideration of the ethical decline in major areas of modern communication also suggested that the ethical factors which enabled Paul in a morally degenerate age to influence beneficially his own world and all subsequent culture are urgently required by our own civilization if modern communication is not to duplicate certain unsavory trends of the Sophistic tradition.

Of all the men of the first century, incomparably the most influential was the Apostle Paul. No one man exercised anything like so much power as he did in molding the future of the Empire. . . . Had it not been for Paul--if one may guess at what might have been--no man would now remember Greek and Roman civilization. . . . Barbarism proved too powerful for the Graeco-Roman civilization unaided by the new religious bond; and every channel through which that civilization was preserved, or interest in it maintained, either is now or has been in some essential part of its course Christian after the Pauline form. (emphasis ours)

William M. Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, pp. 53, 100.

What they [Cicero and Demosthenes] lacked was not yet revealed--the higher reaches of ethics and a more comprehensive kindness.

"Oratory," The New International Encyclopaedia, Vol. XVII.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer owes an incalculable debt to Dr. Kenneth G. Hance whose kindly and scholarly counsels throughout classwork and research have made "the rough places plain." His untiring guidance and encouragement matched the theme of the study in rendering the penning of these pages an enjoyable and rewarding task.

Special thanks are due to Dr. David C. Ralph and Dr. Richard E. Sullivan who, in conjunction with Dr. Hance, reviewed this manuscript in process and made valuable suggestions.

In addition, the following instructors are gratefully mentioned as the sources of inspiration which contributed to the development of the following study--Dr. Gordon L. Thomas, Dr. Donald H. Ecroyd, Dr. Frederick G. Alexander, and Dr. Petr B. Fischer.

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	INTRODUCTION	iv
I.	THE WORLD OF PAUL'S DAY	1
	The Historical Background to the First Century A.D.	1
	Philosophy in the Graeco-Roman World	26
	Religion in the Graeco-Roman World	44
	Morals of Graeco-Roman Society	63
II.	THE ERA OF THE SECOND SOPHISTIC	75
III.	SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND INFLUENCE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL	96
IV.	ELEMENTS WHICH SHAPED THE ORATORY OF PAUL	107
V.	THE CRITICAL ANALYSES OF SEVEN PAULINE DISCOURSES	120
	First Discourse to the Christians at Thessalonica	123
	Second Discourse to the Christians at Thessalonica.	137
	The First Discourse to the Corinthians	143
	The Second Discourse to the Corinthians	188
	The Discourse to the Galatians	251
	The Discourse to the Philippians	332
	The Discourse to Philemon and the Church at His House	373
VI.	THE STYLE OF THE DISCOURSES	406
VII.	PAULINE ETHOS COMPARED WITH THE ETHOS OF LATE AMERICAN PREACHING THEORY	433
VIII.	THE RELEVANCE OF PAULINE ETHICS FOR MODERN COMMUNICATION	453
IX.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	493
	APPENDIX	517
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	531

VITA

The writer was born at Townsville, Queensland, Australia on February 2, 1929. High School requirements were completed in Sydney, New South Wales, in 1943, and for three years thereafter positions in the Composing and Editorial departments of Associated Newspapers, Sydney, were filled. In 1947, the writer decided to train for the Ministry and spent the next four years at the Australasian Missionary College, New South Wales. From 1950 to 1957, he was engaged in evangelistic and pastoral ministry, and then returned to the Australasian Missionary College to complete the B. A. degree. This was followed by the M. A. at Potomac University, Washington, D. C. In 1959, studies for the Ph. D. were begun at Michigan State University.

INTRODUCTION

I. The Title of the Study:

"A Rhetorical Study of Certain Pauline Addresses"

II. Purpose and Justification of the Study:

One of the most well-known orators of the ancient world is also the least studied for his art. While the public speaking of the Apostle Paul was largely responsible for the spread of those values which have moulded much of Western thought, the man himself has been virtually disregarded from the standpoint of rhetoric. It should be remembered that orators such as Augustine, Luther, Wesley, and others began their careers as a result of inspiration from the words of Paul, and the homiletics of almost twenty centuries has been considerably influenced by the same source. While numerous literary and speech critics have asserted that Paul's mind was "eminently oratorical,"[1] study concentrated on this aspect of the man has been slight, despite the fact that, as we shall see later, we have highly reliable transcripts of some of Paul's addresses--conceivably more accurate transcripts than we have of men such as Chatham, Sheridan, and Fox.

At this juncture it should be pointed out that we are not limited to the six speeches of the Apostle recorded in Acts for specimens of Paul's oratory. Most of his epistles are public addresses which he desired to be delivered to specific church audiences. They were

---

[1]John Franklin Genung, A Guidebook to the Biblical Literature (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1919), p. 623.

never intended by Paul as "literature." To him, their sole purpose was persuasion towards certain courses of action in order that local exigencies might be met.[1] It is this fact that explains why Paul used Koiné Greek instead of the classical Greek of literature.[2]

> This custom of Paul's [dictating] is not without significance for the style of his letters. In reading them we must bear in mind that Paul usually, perhaps always, spoke these sentences aloud, and that they were intended to be read aloud in the assembly of the church. . . . Hence the kernel of the epistles to the churches consists of a speech by the Apostle. . . .
>
> Thus in many respects the style of the Pauline letters is that of spoken language. . . . But there was not lacking the conventional correctness which was to be found in any case of public speech in Greek. . . .[3]

The concept which conceives of some materials as being "rhetorical" (rather than literary) irrespective of their status as written or spoken is not new. The following is an attempt to define a speech as a literary form.

> A speech as a literary form then is a prose composition of varying length, fashioned for a specific or generic audience, usually but not necessarily spoken and listened to, written or recorded in some way on brain, paper, or tape for permanence, in which are inter-related author, reading or listening audience, theme and occasion; it has ethical appeal and universality, moving force and fluency, its design is artistic and its purpose is to direct the reader or listener to a conclusion selected by the composer.
>
> Isocrates' Areopagiticus was not delivered, was not

---

[1]Adolf Gustav Deissman, Paul; A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. William E. Wilson (New York: Harper, 1957), pp. 8, 13.

[2]Kathleen E. Innes, The Bible as Literature (London: J. Cape, 1930), p. 281.

[3]Thomas S. Kepler, Contemporary Thinking About Paul (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950), p. 178.

> intended to be delivered, but it has served as a model speech for 2300 years.
>
> . . . Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, when under consideration for censure by the Senate, released a speech which was front-paged across the country. He was so busy he did not actually speak it but had it "inserted in the RECORD."[1]

We are reminded also that Wilbur Gilman analyzed six of Milton's tractates and found that they had "all the elements of a delivered address, except delivery itself."

In Herbert A. Wichelns' article "The Literary Criticism of Oratory" we read as follows:

> If now we turn to rhetorical criticism . . . we find that its point of view is patently single. It is not concerned with permanence, nor yet with beauty. It is concerned with effect. It regards a speech as a communication to a specific audience and holds its business to be the analysis and appreciation of the orator's method of imparting his ideas to his hearers.[2]

The criteria specified in these quotations are fully met by certain of Paul's epistles, which originated in the desire, not of adding to literature, but to influence specific groups of people in emergency situations.

There are certain characteristics which make the Pauline records of more than ordinary interest to students of oratory, especially in these days when the special study of ethos seems to be looming larger than ever in the minds of many speech critics.

1. It is likely that the Pauline epistles contain the best example of ethos in all ancient oratory. No speech records extant present a similar interweaving of the personality of the source. Commentator

---

[1]Richard Murphy, "The Speech as a Literary Genre," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (April, 1958), p. 119.

[2]Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans (New York: The Century Co., 1925), p. 209.

after commentator remarks at the way in which Paul delivers himself rather than merely a message.

2. It is also likely that in Paul we have one of the best available illustrations of Quintilian's Ideal Orator--"A Good man skilled in speaking."

3. Though these records come from the age of the Second Sophistic, they reveal a style entirely different from that which was characteristic of the age. On this ground alone it is interesting to seek the reason for this divergence from the norm of that day.

4. These materials are also distinctive in that they reveal a unique blending of two rhetorical cultures, the Greek and the Hebraic.

5. Furthermore, these addresses of Paul contain many significant references to speech which have influenced the attitudes and values of many orators since his time.

6. That speech style which concentrates on matter rather than form, and yet which frequently soars into sublime expression finds abundant illustration here.

Paul does not always follow orthodox rhetorical method but his procedures can be evaluated only when his particular objectives are taken into account. About thirty years ago in discussing the theory of George Campbell, William P. Sandford declared that the former's concept of speech ends,

> with its inevitable corollary that the means by which the orator shall accomplish his purpose must differ according to the nature of the effect desired, and that whatever material is introduced into the speech must be judged according to its 'subserviency or want of subserviency to that end'. . . .[1]

---

[1]William P. Sandford, English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828, p. 146, cited by Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), p. 135.

Sandford asserts that this 'strikes the keynote of modern theories of speech composition.' Probably it was this thought that inspired the dissertation of John G. Rudin entitled "The Concept of Ethos in Late American Preaching." Here it is indicated that preaching differs from secular speaking in its added emphasis upon ethos. Rudin asserts, for example, that the preaching theory which he is studying embodies the concept that truth should be conveyed not only by logic but by what he terms 'incarnation.'[1] Every reader of the epistles of Paul ultimately becomes aware that this concept of preaching is strongly Pauline.

While Rudin's dissertation dealt with late American homiletical theory this present work aims at giving emphasis to the same concept of ethos but this time illustrating from the opposite end of the era. Concerning the conclusions of Rudin we might ask--Are they true of preaching in general, or only of pulpit artistry in recent decades? The earliest preacher who could possibly be studied to test the matter is the Apostle we are considering. As Wild has pointed out, Paul is the only Biblical writer to employ the Greek rhetorical mode.[2]

The present dissertation analyzes certain of the Pauline epistles with the specific purpose in mind of discovering whether this ancient preaching was similar to or different from that which is required by the modern homilétical theory studied by Rudin. An attempt is made to ascertain whether those attributes of preaching implicit in the body of homiletic theory surveyed by the recent investigator are also present and to a similar degree in the preaching of the first Christian

---

[1]John G. Rudin, "The Concept of Ethos in Late American Preaching" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Speech, Northwestern University), p. 471.

[2]Laura H. Wild, A Literary Guide to the Bible (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1922), p. 265.

minister to employ Greek rhetorical forms. If such is the case, it will have been demonstrated that the concept of ethos discussed by Rudin applies to a much broader field than merely late American homiletical theory. Likewise, the whole question of ethos, its importance and method, should have some further light cast upon it by the analysis of Paul's rhetorical practices.

Furthermore, some recent writings on speech criticism have stressed anew the ethics involved in the speech situation. For example, when Edwin Black discussed Plato's emphasis on morality in public speaking, he made the following significant statement.

> When in recent history we find the clamorous spirit of fanaticism at large in the world sustained by rhetorical discourse; when we contemplate the undiminished and undiminishing potentiality for savagery latent in all men, waiting to be triggered by suasive language; and when we observe the Sophists of our time, rationally discredited but thriving still, we may begin to suspect that after all Plato was even wiser than we had thought.[1]

Inasmuch as Paul, more than any other, was responsible for the propagation to the western world of the values referred to above, it cannot but be profitable to examine at the source this speaker's own concepts regarding communication and the values inevitably associated with it.

Summary of Objectives

The objectives of the present study are:

To study Paul's rhetorical method from certain of his epistles.

To examine particularly the ethical proof which seems to dominate his addresses.

---

[1]Edwin Black, "Plato's View of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (December 1958), p. 374.

To compare the former with the conclusions of Rudin in his dissertation.

To examine in this situation Quintilian's concept of the orator as "a good man skilled in speaking."

To substantiate or otherwise from this Pauline study the case for emphasis on ethics in communication.

Only those epistles which the majority of modern critics acknowledge as Pauline have been considered, and from among these there have been selected those addressed to specific audiences in answer to some local problem. The first criterion eliminated Hebrews and Colossians; and the second negated the use of Romans, Ephesians, and the pastoral epistles. Romans is more in the nature of a treatise and bears none of the usual marks of urgent composition in response to a local emergency. Many scholars hold that Ephesians was more in the nature of a circular letter as it contains no personal allusions whatever to the members of a distinct congregation. The pastoral letters were not intended to be read aloud to a group. Rather, they contain personal counsel to ministerial friends. The following remain as subjects for study.

Galatians--written to reclaim churchmembers who were backsliding into a Judaizing heresy.

1 Corinthians--written to rebuke schism and irregularities in church procedure.

2 Corinthians--written to defend Paul's apostolic authority against the slanders of false teachers.

Philemon--written on behalf of a runaway slave to the church group meeting at the home of the slave-owner.

1 Thessalonians--written to encourage those who, while anticipating Christ's soon return, had been saddened by the death of friends.

2 Thessalonians--written to rebuke those who had forsaken their normal occupations on the assumption that Christ was soon to appear.

Philippians--written to give thanks for gifts sent to him in prison and to plead for unity and steadfastness in the church.

The average length of these epistles is such that about half an hour would be required to read aloud to a congregation a typical Pauline message. Only Philemon falls much below this, and 1 Corinthians at the other end of the scale would constitute an address approximately one hour in length.

Materials and Sources

The writings of Paul as translated in various versions and with some reference to the original Koiné Greek forms have been the basic sources for this study. In addition, all available commentaries on Paul's letters and a number of recognized works of rhetorical theory have been consulted. Historical texts have been used to provide further background materials, and Rudin's dissertation "The Concept of Ethos in Later American Preaching" served to provide comparison for certain aspects of the investigation.

It will be noticed that there is no lengthy consideration of the question of textual problems. Such an omission does not imply that such problems are non-existent in this instance, but rather that they are so slight as to be insignificant for our purposes. The following quotations are pertinent:

> . . . let us notice what a favorable position is occupied by the New Testament in comparison with other authors of antiquity. The New Testament writings are separated from their earliest manuscript by about 200 years. Virgil is next with an interval of about 350 years; Livy has 500 years; Terence, 700; Horace, 900; Demosthenes, 1200; Plato, 1300; while the great Greek dramatists have an interval of 1400 years or more. Then again, consider the number of extant manuscripts. There is only one

extant copy of the Greek Anthology; the plays of Aeschylus survive in only fifty manuscripts, none of which is complete; those of Sophocles, in about a hundred; Euripides, Cicero, Virgil, and some of the others have several hundred. But when we come to the New Testament, we find 4000 extant manuscripts of all or parts of it in the Greek, to say nothing of 10,000 copies of a translation of it into Latin and numerous manuscripts of translations into other languages.[1]

The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is very great, not less, on a rough computation, then seven-eighths of the whole. The remaining eighth, therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other comparative trivialities, constitute the whole area of criticism. If the principles followed in this edition are sound, this area may be very greatly reduced. . . . setting aside differences of orthography, the words in our opinion still subject to doubt only make up about one-sixtieth of the whole New Testament. In this second estimate the proportion of comparatively trivial variations is beyond measure larger than in the former; so that the amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation is but a small residuary variation, and can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text.[2] (emphasis ours)

Organization

The setting of Pauline oratory (time and place factors) is discussed in an overall view of life in the first century of our era. Such is the content of chapters one and two. The specific background of each discourse, however, is presented with the corresponding rhetorical analysis in chapter five.

---

[1]Samuel A. Cartledge, A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1951), p. 19.

[2]Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Vol. II, p. 2, cited by Cartledge, p. 21.

Since these statements were made, New Testament criticism has advanced still further. The distance now separating the original New Testament from the earliest fragmentary MS available is less than half a century.

Between these sections of history and the case studies has been placed a view of the Apostle in the light of succeeding centuries, and a summary of the main influences which shaped his oratory. Such is the content of chapters three and four. Because references to style would be largely duplicative if placed under each epistle, a separate chapter has been reserved for the detailed consideration of this canon. Other objectives of the study are fulfilled in chapters seven and eight, which deal respectively with Pauline ethos as compared with that of recent homiletic theory and the relevance of Pauline ethics for modern communication.

In the closing chapter an endeavor is made to draw the strands together by indicating the significance of the investigation as a whole. It is inquired whether Pauline oratory has some significance for rhetoric in general, and secondly whether it has particular significance for that branch of oratory, known as preaching, and finally, whether there are some implications for the general field of communication.

CHAPTER I

THE WORLD OF PAUL'S DAY

The Historical Background to the First Century A. D.

It is impossible to view the first century of our era, or any other century, by itself. Like every point in time and event in space it is sequential, a harvest as well as a sowing, consequential as well as causal.

By 14 A. D. civilization had described a semi-circle. Beginning somewhere in the Fertile Crescent, later manifested in the Aegean islands, it moved westward to the European continent. Greece became the fountain of the classical tradition which was to help mold the thought and life of the West for all succeeding centuries. The age of Augustus saw the peak of classical civilization, the zenith of attainment of the ideals of Pericles, Aristotle, Plato, and Alexander. Undeniably, Roman culture was essentially Greek. The Romans usually implemented rather than invented, and this proved particularly true of their culture. To begin to understand the scene in the Roman Empire, therefore, it is vital to trace, cursorily at least, the outlines of the immediately preceding centuries with particular reference to Hellenic and Hellenistic thought which became the inheritance of the Latin conquerors of the Mediterranean.

Five hundred years before Christ, the Athenian Greek represented the appearance of a new human type. The flowering simultaneously of genius and democracy brought forth the fruit of Humanism, which is the

chief characteristic of what we call Classicism. The Greek shook off the shackles of subservience to the hierarchy of superstition, and asserted the right of man to frame his own destiny. Most Athenians refused to accept the pessimistic determinism of some of the Sophists, and chose rather to believe that man could, by balanced personal development and bold endeavor, mold his environment aright. While in religion they were far behind the monotheistic Jews, in every other aspect of culture the Greeks transcended their contemporaries.

> We think and feel differently because of what a little Greek town did during a century or two, twenty-four hundred years ago. What was then produced of art and of thought has never been surpassed and very rarely equalled, and the stamp of it is upon all the art and all the thought of the Western world.[1]

The city state was the cell and microcosm of ancient Greek life. Here it was demonstrated, before Aristotle wrote it, that "man is a political animal." The Greeks were the first to understand the meaning of citizenship, and each of the institutions of the city state spelled out the responsibility of every free Greek to participate in city life. The contribution of every man's best, the act of participation in civic activity, would lead to the betterment of all and the flowering of individual abilities. A great crop of brilliant literature, art, and architecture bore testimony to the apparent accuracy of this philosophy. The names of Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Anaxagoras, Democritus, Hippocrates, Protagoras, do not all stem from Athens, but each is representative of the Greek genius which contributed to Western thought. Despite the glory and success here suggested, however, there existed in Greek thought a fundamental concept which invited disaster.

---

[1]Edith Hamilton, The Greek Way to Western Civilization (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1959), p. 7.

The basic flaw of Classicism was made manifest in the anti-climax of Greek history which succeeded the glories of Marathon and Salamis. The bloody Peloponnesian wars, and the prolonged disorders which followed, demonstrated that man, for all his brilliance, was not such a creature who could be governed by pure reason. The Greeks, who prided themselves on their sense, were never sufficiently rational to establish a lasting unity among themselves. While the Hellenes were, for the most part, linked by the common bonds of ancestry, religion, and culture, the forces of disruption were ever stronger than those of centralization. The spirit of rivalry and separation, although illogical to the extreme in view of their common Greek problems, overwhelmed the weaker tendencies to agreement and unity. Pericles had been responsible for the political, economic, and cultural aggression of Athens which had provoked the fear and hate of other Greeks. During his leadership the political center of gravity was transferred from the Council of 500 to the Assembly. From this time the Magistrates merely discharged the will of the ever variable Assembly. It is to this deterioration in the final form of her democracy that Athens owed her failure and fall. The menace of imperial Athens was one of the causes for the Greek failure to create a form of government which could reconcile the peculiar characteristics of the nation with the conditions necessary for the continued existence of a powerful state.

The fourth century contrasted unfavourably with the preceding. No real civic discipline existed, and the preference for the interest of the majority was a thing of the past. A levelling tendency, with its consequent fomenting of suspicion and hasty, cruel action, prevailed. Socrates was one who fell before the tyrannous spirit which had resulted from failure, fear, and panic. The race for money and power, begun in the Periclean Age, was now accelerated; and the ancient Athenian

values disintegrated for many. A bureaucracy replaced democracy. Economic decline, social tension, intellectual confusion, sophistry, and intercity strife have been rightly labelled as the characteristics of the fourth century in Greece.

In the spirit of reaction and disillusionment, there arose some new political and philosophical schemes. A new Panhellenism, for example, was espoused and promulgated by Isocrates particularly. He incorporated the distinguishing ideals of Hellenism into an educational system which was to train many of the world's thinkers for at least two millenniums. Plato also had lived through the tragedy of the Peloponnesian wars. He hated the democracy which had brought strife to Greece, and the Sophists who had set up false ideals. He put in writing the idealism of Socrates as elaborated, and at least partly transformed, by his own thinking. In The Republic Plato pictured the model-state as one ruled by a philosopher-king. In his system of philosophy he rebelled against such teachings as those of Heraclitus, that all things are in a continual flux, and he protested also against the dictum of Protagoras, that man is the measure of all things. Aristotle, Plato's successor, never entirely freed himself from the idealism of his teacher, but his own writings were more scientific than metaphysical. The scientific examination of life gave Aristotle the basis for his own system of metaphysics. He believed in a teleological view of life with God as the great overall End or objective.[1]

Philip of Macedon, an enthusiastic admirer of Greek civilization, had seen the necessity for unity of government, and he had implemented this belief in his own country. Philip and Isocrates were in touch with one another through correspondence. The latter wrote to the king urging the necessity for the unification of all Greek cities. "As a lover of

---

[1]Plato and Aristotle are discussed in the section on Philosophy.

Athens, he begged Philip to be friendly with that great city; if they worked together they could extend Greek culture over the world."[1]

> . . . Philip had introduced Greek culture into his country. Guests from Greece and other countries found the royal Court at Pella, his capital, conducted with so much dignity, style and luxury that the social life and manners of the Macedonian aristocracy compared favorably with those of Athens.[2]

The rise of Philip's son was also the rise of Plato's philosopher-king. Reared under the tutelage of Aristotle, nourished on Homer, and sharing his father's admiration of Hellenism, Alexander went forth as a reincarnated Achilles to conquer the world and bless it with the legacy of Hellenism. He it was who was largely responsible for the Hellenistic age with its welding of Greek and oriental thought. He was not only one of the great military geniuses of all times, but due to the influences of his father's court he was also a missionary of the Hellenes. While it cannot be held that Alexander was entirely responsible for the spread of Greek ideas, his conquest gave an impetus to the expansion of Greek influence which for centuries had been under way.

> "As the pioneer of Hellenic cultivation," wrote Edward Freeman, "he became in the end the pioneer of Christianity"; . . . "the victories of Christian Emperors, the teaching of Christian Fathers, the abiding life of the tongue and arts of Greece far beyond the limits of old Hellas, perhaps the endurance of Greek nationality down to our own times, all sprang from the triumphs of Alexander."[3]

This founder of a new civilization was the ideal ruler as far as the following centuries were concerned--a superman who could through

---

[1]Agnes Savill, Alexander the Great and His Time (London: Rockcliff Publishing Corporation, 1955), p. 5.

[2]Ibid.

[3]T. R. Glover, The World of the New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), p. 57.

his ability and virtue solve the problem of disunity and create a peaceful world.

> . . . Alexander is one of the supreme fertilizing forces of history. He lifts the world into new habits of mind and brings in a new epoch. He gives science and civilization a new scope. . . . Incidentally, he gave Greece a new speech, for the koiné is the outcome of his blending all Greek breeds and dialects in a new distribution over a wider world. He brings in also the craving for a new spiritual unity. The ideal city-state was still of interest to his teacher--a curious illustration of the detachment of the academic mind; for, while Aristotle speculated, Alexander was in fact so acting as to change the face of the world and to make the city-state a mere anachronism; and the King was providing that stimulus from the actual world which prompted the Stoic to conceive of another ideal state altogether the cosmos, the city of Zeus, the greatest conceivable unity of all. Two of the chief of Alexander's thoughts survive to this day--the divine kingship seen in Caesar and Pope; and that universalism in thought, philosophy and religion, which we meet first in Stoicism and then in our own religion.[1]

Tarn has made a similar summary regarding the influence of Alexander:

> . . . , whatever else he was, he was one of the supreme fertilising forces of history. He lifted the civilised world out of one groove and set it in another; he started a new epoch; nothing could again be as it had been. He greatly enlarged the bounds of knowledge and of human endeavour, and gave to Greek science and Greek civilisation a scope and an opportunity such as they had never yet possessed. Particularism was replaced by the idea of the 'inhabited world', the common possession of civilised men; trade and commerce were internationalised, and the 'inhabited world' bound together by a network both of new routes and cities, and of common interests. Greek culture, heretofore practically confined to Greeks, spread throughout that world; and for the use of its inhabitants, in place of the many dialects of Greece, there grew up the form of Greek known as the koiné, the 'common speech.' The Greece that taught Rome was the Hellenistic world which Alexander made: the old Greece counted for little till modern scholars re-created Periclean Athens. So far as the modern world derives its civilisation from Greece, it largely owes it to Alexander that it had the opportunity. If he

---

[1]Glover, ibid., pp. 62-64.

could not fuse races, he transcended the national State; and to transcend national States meant to transcend national cults; men came to feel after the unity which must lie beneath the various religions. Outwardly, this unity was ultimately satisfied in the official worship of the Roman Emperor, which derived from the worship of Alexander after his death; but beside this external form there grew up in men's hearts the longing for a true spiritual unity. And it was Alexander who created the medium in which the idea, when it came, was to spread. For it was due to him that Greek civilisation penetrated western Asia; and even if much of the actual work was done by his successors, he broke the path; without him they would not have been. Consequently, when at last Christianity showed the way to that spiritual unity after which men were feeling, there was ready to hand a medium for the new religion to spread in, the common Hellenistic civilisation of the 'inhabited world'; without that, the conquests made by Christianity might have been as slow and difficult as they became when the bounds of that common civilisation were overpassed.

But if the things he did were great, one thing he dreamt was greater. We may put it that he found the Ideal State of Aristotle, and substituted the Ideal State of Zeno. It was not merely that he overthrew the narrow restraints of the former, and, in place of limiting men by their opportunity, created opportunities adequate for men in a world where none need be a pauper and restrictions on population were meaningless. Aristotle's State had still cared nothing for humanity outside its own borders; the stranger must still be a serf or an enemy. Alexander changed all that. When he declared that all men were alike sons of one Father, and when at Opis he prayed that Macedonians and Persians might be partners in the commonwealth and that the peoples of his world might live in harmony and in unity of heart and mind, he proclaimed for the first time the unity and brotherhood of mankind.[1]

With the passing of Alexander, the chief bond of his empire was dissolved. His own strong person had been the guarantee of international unity. Contesting generals now warred for over a score of years until a settlement of a kind had been reached with Antigonus I occupying the Greek peninsula, Ptolemy inheriting Egypt, and Seleucus taking over

---

[1]W. W. Tarn, Alexander the Great (Cambridge: University Press, 1951), pp. 145, 147.

most of the eastern part of the empire. While Alexander's aspirations were given partial reality in the history of his immediate survivors by the widespread nature of Hellenistic civilisation, the constant strife of the years following his death demonstrated that the world was still without the key to universal peace and orderly government. The Empire of the Romans was to fulfill this need. The seat of world power which had long been in the Orient was to shift to Europe, where the concepts of the world's essential unity and the value of the individual were to find their mature expression.

Rise of Rome and Its Empire

The rise of the Roman Empire seems almost accidental. Certainly there was no imperial vision among the early Latins, and control of the world came almost as a shock to the citizens on the Tiber. One of the miracles of the ages is the skillful reconstruction of social processes accomplished by the Romans in the first century in order successfully to cope with their unanticipated inheritance. Before discussing the idealistic motivation which led to this reconstruction, we would briefly trace the rise to supremacy of this ancient people.

When Greek civilization reached its peak, the Romans were still leading a tribal life. Probably it was contact with the early Greek colonists and traders which awakened the Latins. In the fifth century B. C. occurred a conflict similar to that which had transpired previously between the commoners and the aristocrats of Athens, and which had resulted in the adopting of the laws of Draco and Solon. The Romans also received a written code of laws, and the ordinary freeman found a form of representation in the person of the tribune. It should ever be remembered that Rome from an early age displayed considerable gift for government. The citadel of that name had in early times offered

refuge to surrounding Latin tribes in times of crisis, and eventually the latter became partners with the Roman citizens in a common republic. Thus, almost from the beginning, it seemed to be Rome's foreign policy to accept aliens on near equal terms. Through the pursuit of this principle, Rome had unified the whole of Italy by 264 B.C. when her first conflict with Carthage began.

The great Punic commercial center of North Africa saw in Rome a rival for the markets of Sicily and the southern coasts of France. The result of the ensuing conflict of twenty-four years' duration was the defeat of Carthage and the addition of Sicily to Rome's possessions. In the very nature of things it seemed that one power or the other must be eradicated from the scene, and two subsequent wars in 218-201 and 149-146 wiped out Carthage and left Rome as the supreme power of the West.

Between 200 and 146 B.C. the remnants of Alexander's great empire had come largely under Roman control. When Hannibal sought the aid of the kings of Macedonia and Syria, he paved the way for the ultimate absorption of these territories by his enemies. Syrian armies were defeated by Roman arms near Magnesia about forty years before the outbreak of the Third Punic War, and Asia Minor became a Roman protectorate in consequence. After the third Macedonian War, that country was divided by Rome into four independent republics, and Illyria into three. In Egypt, native revolts against Greek rule had begun about 230 B.C., and it was a somewhat despairing Ptolemy who had sought the help of Rome against threats from Macedonia and Syria. When Antiochus IV invaded Egypt during the third Macedonia war, an ambassador of the Roman Senate peremptorily ordered him to go home again.

At first the Senate refused to annex defeated territories such as Macedonia, Greece, and Syria, because the burden of direct government of these areas seemed too heavy to assume. By the middle of the century, however, the policy had changed, and the ensuing annexation led to the creation of an extended empire which made of the Mediterranean a Roman lake.

Thus by the mysterious outcome of the centuries, the simple residents of a backward Latin city had been thrust into the unsought yet responsible position of leadership of the world.

Underneath the glory in which Rome now basked because of her conquests lay the manifestations of rather inglorious conditions in Italy itself. Prosperity, as always, brought its problems. The Republic was flooded with the profits of war. A new aristocracy of wealth arose, and this class invested in land and slaves. As for the freeborn farmer of a lower financial status, he found that he could no longer compete with the large landowners who worked their estates by slave-labor. Thousands of these smaller farmers forsook the country for the cities, particularly for the city of Rome. Here they became constituents of the Roman mob, eager to listen to the promises of any revolutionary. Old-time aristocratic patriots like Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus attempted to bring about the needed reforms, but neither was permitted to live very long. Professional soldiers named Marius and Sulla next vied with one another for leadership. Each of these men claimed a large following, with the former representing the disinherited freemen, and the latter advocating the views of the landowners. Sulla increased his glory by defeating Mithradates, king of Pontus, who had sought to rally the natives of the East against Roman engulfment. During Sulla's absence, Marius had marched on Rome, assassinated enemy Senators, and had himself elected as Consul. Within a matter of days, however, Marius was dead.

Upon Sulla's return there was another period of extermination which nearly truncated the career of Julius Caesar. The ensuing dictatorship of Sulla lasted for three years, and in 79 B.C. he resigned. Shortly afterwards he died in retirement at Naples.

There was nothing permanent about the constitution for which Sulla had been responsible, and the years which followed witnessed a succession of remarkable individualists who sought by all available means to take over the helm of the Republic. "Most of these new leaders had been under thirty when Sulla died; they began to fill important offices about 70; and they remained in power until the death of Caesar a quarter of a century later."[1]

In Spain, the Marian leader Sertorius had provoked a revolt in 80 B.C. with much initial success. After the death of Sulla, Pompey by command of the Senate, replaced the Roman generals who had proved unsuccessful against the rebels. By 71 B.C. the revolt had been quelled and Spain pacified. En route to Rome the victorious Pompey gave the last stroke in the liquidation of the slave army led by Spartacus, a project successfully prosecuted up to that time by the wealthy Crassus. These two Roman generals now campaigned for the consulship, and both were elected in 70 B.C. as a result of the persuasive effects of the presence of their troops. In private life each consul feared and detested the other.

In the same year, the equestrian scholar and orator Cicero conducted a masterly prosecution of the Sicilian extortioner Verres. By successfully defending soon afterwards the governor of Transalpine Gaul against similar charges, his reputation was established, and his rapid advance in politics apparently guaranteed.

---

[1]Joseph Swain and William Armstrong, The Peoples of the Ancient World (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), pp. 384-385.

After the joint consulship of Crassus and Pompey was over, the former returned to the business of augmenting his wealth, and the latter, within two years, was placed in command of the armies fighting the energetic Mithradates in Asia Minor. Pompey successfully drove the rebel back into the mountains, where he committed suicide.

Meanwhile, back in Rome, Crassus and others had their fears that Pompey would return to Rome as a new Sulla. Fearful of proscription should this occur, Crassus entered into an alliance with Julius Caesar, who had become well-known in Rome both through his oratorical powers and his former position as quaestor. In 65 B.C. Crassus and Caesar were accused of being implicated in the unsuccessful plot of Catiline to murder the consuls and seize government, but the entire affair seems to have been carefully hushed up without too much loss to either Crassus or Caesar. A noteworthy result of the plot, however, was the further prestige it gave to Cicero, who had boldly exposed Catiline.

Pompey returned in 62 B.C. and to the relief of the Senate, he disbanded his army. But two years later, enraged with the apparent ingratitude of the government, Pompey joined with Caesar and Crassus to form the first Triumvirate. Soon afterwards Crassus lost his life in warfare against the Parthians. As for Caesar, he decided to increase his influence and fame by the conquest of Gaul. When he later heard that Pompey had been appointed as Dictator for life, Caesar made the momentous decision to cross the Rubicon, despite the command of the Senate. The Roman people hailed him as a hero and savior, and by 47 B.C. Pompey was dead, and the remaining member of the Triumvirate absolute monarch except in name.

Julius Caesar proved more than a great soldier. He was a far-sighted and able statesman. He extended citizenship to aliens in distant places, planted colonies, and restored Corinth and Carthage. He made

plans for the codification of Roman law and for the reorganizing of the provincial system. He believed that the latter should not be a mere military despotism.

> Strabo says that Caesar was always a lover of Alexander, a sentence which does one good to keep in memory, linking the great. He has, as Mr. Heitland says, a large imperial mind; he is a statesman above all men in antiquity. No man is more essentially Roman, but he has shared Greek culture, and he has lived in the larger world; and, like Alexander, he wished to keep and to combine in a larger union everything that has been proved of value. He seems to have thought of a world reorganized on the basis of the monarchy that the Hellenistic kingdoms had been developing. The central idea is a government answering to the real facts. A sentence in Suetonius' life of him tells us how Caesar reformed the Roman calendar, which was ninety days wrong. "He fitted the year to the course of the sun," says Suetonius. The sun, after all, is the final authority for any calendar; and the calendar of Julius was used for centuries, and was only superseded in Russia about 1917. In a very similar way Caesar fits the government of the world to the great essential facts of the world. He is a realist, says Mommsen, and he develops what is essentially a monarchical system--monarchical, though not royal--where, at the head of all, there is one brain, and a great brain, where all others responsible for the administration have to answer to the man, in whose hands are gathered all the threads of government. Everything points to the greatness of this man.[1]

Caesar had named as his heir the eighteen year old Octavian. Nevertheless, Mark Antony attempted to seize power after the fateful event on the Ides of March 44 B.C. To counter this intended coup, Octavian had the Senate appoint himself as general, and thereafter he brought his army into Rome to procure for him the further office of consul. His next step was to form a triumvirate with Antony and Lepidus, his rivals, in order to crush the republican forces under Brutus and Cassius. The year 42 B.C. witnessed the ensuing battle of Philippi,

---

[1]Glover, pp. 147-148.

and the successful triumvirs divided the world among themselves. Antony was to have Gaul and the eastern provinces. To Lepidus went Africa, and to Octavius, Italy and Spain.

Soon afterwards Lepidus gave Africa to Octavius, and after the latter defeated Antony at Actium in 31 B.C. he stood without a rival in the place that had been Caesar's. The Empire which he inherited stretched approximately from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, and from the Danube and the Rhine to the Nile. The population of this area was somewhere between eighty and one hundred and twenty million people. For the first time in centuries, this region was now to enjoy comparative peace.

Emerging from the tensions and losses of a terrible internal crisis, the unprepared Roman conquerors now urgently required a solution to the problems of universal government. Did they have the personal resources to meet such a challenge? What was the nature of the typical Roman who by circumstances had been thrust into the position of representative of the leadership of a world empire?

> He was a new type in the world. Alexander and his Successors had represented a type differing from the old Greek standards. This was a third kind of man, a variety unfamiliar, and not too welcome. It is the legal mind in the soldier, the administrator, the supreme administrator who conquers and who keeps what he conquers.[1]

> To the Greek who really took the trouble to study him, the Roman was a very curious and interesting character.[2]

> The Greek would adorn his city with statues and edifices of beauty; the Roman provided his city with a system of sewers.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 89-90.

[2] Ibid., pp. 92-93.

[3] Ibid., p. 94.

> It is again a people, as Plutarch notes, meticulously careful in all that refers to ritual or the divine, in strange contrast to the slovenly ways of the Greek in handling his city's religion.[1]

These last few lines are significant. They help to answer the question--What was the underlying concept which motivated Roman emperors and peoples to successful government? The answer must also throw light upon the life and thought of Roman society in the first century A.D.

Rome's Inheritance of the Classical Tradition

The resources which finally enabled Rome to stabilize her Empire were spiritual and moral much more than they were material. It was the conviction that fate had destined them to propagate classical civilization which gave impelling power to both Princeps and people. Through the influence of religious concepts and a borrowed Greek culture, these ideals were primarily manifested; and ultimately they were spread abroad by the poets of Rome as guiding stars for the new missionaries of classicism.

The historical fact that there was considerable religious skepticism among the upper classes of Rome has often led to the disparagement of the significance of Roman religion in the Augustan age. Some well documented and carefully prepared studies in recent years have indicated, however, that it was respect for Roman religion which energized the implementation of classical ideals in the Empire. The evidence indicates that at the beginning of the Christian era the Romans recast their way of life to accomplish the final shaping of classical civilization. Furthermore, they were apparently motivated to do this by the religious conviction that it was their divinely appointed destiny to rule mankind

---

[1] Ibid., p. 95.

with justice and peace, in order that all men might be free to pursue the good life. Because this view is contrary to that expressed by some older historians, we draw heavily by way of citation from some modern influential scholars.

> To take one point before others, so much is plain, that cult, the kernel of Roman religion, has a far wider importance for state and politics than has generally been supposed. The careful and unremitting worship of the gods will in that case have been the necessary condition for the rise and rule of Rome. . . . The idea that it is the gods who fix the destiny of Rome and therewith hold it in their hands appears everywhere in unmistakable form.[1]

> The question is always being raised whether it is proper to speak of a religion of the age of Augustus, at least of one that deserves the name in the strict and proper sense and that derives its powers from something more than political motives. As in the forms of the state, so too in the reorganization of religion and cult, scholars have thought that they could recognize a mere creation of the Emperor himself. Dictated by the will of the Emperor not merely to restore the state, but to build it up in such a way that the person of the 'Princeps' should be the real centre of support for its structure, that order seemed to have taken shape entirely under the influence of expediency and calculation. Of a true and deep relation to religion, in the Emperor at least, there need, it was thought, be no question.
>
> It might appear as a confirmation of this view that the age itself seemed incapable of an original religious movement. The last years of the Republic had set the seal on the recoil from the gods of tradition. The philosophy of Epicurus, which banished them to a blissful middle kingdom, not to be reached by any human appeal, could at the beginning of this age count the best Romans among its adherents. Hence it seemed impossible to credit the following age with a belief of the old kind. Whatever was offered in the way of outward glories, whether solemn ceremonies of cult, grand new buildings or restoration of the old, could only be designed to work externally on the great masses of the people. For the others, the philosophic speculations about the nature and activities of the gods--above all, the theology of the Stoa--

---

[1]Franz Altheim, A History of Roman Religion, trans. Harold Mattingly (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1938), p. 423.

> supplied a practical means of disposing of the inherited conceptions.
>
> Such is the view that still finds supporters to-day, that may even, if we disregard a few exceptions, rank as orthodox.[1]

But,

> the epoch and its religion are not something that simply occurred, something that ripened to full growth; their appearance is linked in time with the appearance of the ruler; the new element is there overnight. First, we find a heyday of the teachings of Epicurus, an elegant scepticism or, at best, a philosophic interpretation of the popular belief--and, a few years later, a complete change of heart--what had before been scorned not only taken seriously, but almost recognized as the meaning of human existence.[2]

Altheim significantly refers to Horace and Virgil as "those two great men who determined the spiritual state of the Rome of their day."[3]

> Everything that we have learned to describe as the meaning of the system of Augustus, the 'will to order, clarity, moderation, health, conservatism, consistency'--all that is to be found in the poets before ever it was manifested in the renewal of the state by Augustus.[4]

Glover's statement regarding the Aeneid supports this:

> . . . out of it come three things: the worth once more of that Italian race, the value of human character as seen in Aeneas, and of the Imperium that God has given to the Roman people.[5]

Cochrane also agrees with this viewpoint when he points out that the classical idealism of Greece, popularized by Romans such as Cicero prior to the days of Augustus, received its dynamic in the poetry of Virgil.

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 369, 370.

[2]Ibid., p. 371.

[3]Ibid., p. 377.

[4]Ibid., p. 384.

[5]Glover, p. 113.

> It is a truism to say that ideas have no legs; by themselves they do not march. Something, therefore, in the nature of a dynamic was needed in order to impart to Ciceronianism the vitality which it lacked; something to win it acceptance and make it what it was destined to become--the common coin of posterity. This dynamic it was the function of Vergil to provide. In providing it, he supplied the final ingredient to the ideology of the Augustan age.[1]

Those who like Cicero believed in the classical virtues saw in the failure of Pompey and Caesar the result of character defects. Cicero believed in the existence of a definite distinction between right and wrong. He opposed with all his might the doctrine of Lucretius. This is important if we accept the view of scholars such as Cochrane, who asserts that Cicero "was the medium for the propagation of those ideas which informed the law and institutions of the empire."[2]

> There is a moral influence in great literature, whatever its theme; and it is indeed to be felt as you read Cicero. He is always the advocate of a higher life, a moral and reflective life, consciously and deliberately the advocate of it, and unconsciously, for his belief in the best informs all he does. With all his weaknesses, says Mr. Heitland, there hangs about him "a certain atmosphere of truth, of goodness and of nobility." He was the most highly cultivated man of antiquity, says Mr. Warde Fowler. He loved all that was beautiful--a beautiful house, works of art, poetry. He dreamed that he could write verse, and Juvenal laughed at him for it, but Virgil read Cicero's verse and learned something. If he was no poet, he certainly could write prose.
>
> In his personal ideals and endeavours, far more than in his successes, Cicero sets conscience on the throne of life. He was the Latin world's teacher in philosophy.[3]

"It was through Cicero that Greek thought reached the world."[4] Cicero also believed that:

---

[1]Charles Norris Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 61.

[2]Ibid., p. 39.

[3]Glover, pp. 109-110.

[4]Ibid., p. 111.

> . . . sentiments like loyalty and justice (pietas et justitia), upon which the life of organized society depends, had their ultimate basis in religion and that they could survive only if this fact were recognized. Accordingly, he rejected the facile identification which scientific materialism had made between religion and superstition, and maintained that the true alternative to superstition was a form of high religion, i.e. of religion purified and illuminated by the knowledge of nature.[1]

It is De Officiis which best expresses this philosopher's concept of the purpose of life. He declares that men exist in order to attain the complete potential of being by the faithful discharge of obligations to themselves and to others. The moral ideal of Plato is elevated as a guide. Particular stress is given to the duties of magistrates. He summarizes the duties of public office as follows:

> (1) to maintain the rights of property;
> (2) to abstain from burdensome taxation;
> (3) to ensure to every one an abundance of the necessities of life;
> (4) to be scrupulously clean-handed, above the suspicion of greed or corruption.[2]

> We have already referred to the estimates placed upon the De Officiis by great modern authorities. In this essay the author gives final utterance to his conviction that the end for which nature has designed mankind is the achievement of what may be called empirical selfhood, and that the purpose of organized society is to promote its development by establishing and maintaining adequate social controls. In so doing, Cicero proclaims an ideal of excellence not unworthy of human beings. At the same time, he insists upon their capacity to realize that ideal through a self-imposed discipline in which the passions are subjected to the control of reason; and in this he sees a possibility of transcending the limitations of barbarism and of 'civilizing', without supressing, the ego.[3]

Such concepts as this led to the Roman ideal that its First Citizen should be a kind of "superman"--a philosopher and ruler combined as

---

[1]Cochrane, p. 41.

[2]Ibid., p. 54.

[3]Ibid., pp. 56-57.

pictured by Plato. He must of necessity be a man of supreme virtue as well as great ability in order that the gods might work through him.

Augustus looked back to Cicero for the justification of his power. The writings of Horace and Virgil gave their support to the picture of the Princeps as a worthy constituent and representative of the gods.

> It need hardly be stressed that both Virgil and Horace voiced a sentiment and attitude that is absolutely in harmony with the order of Augustus. It has, however, recently been emphasized that it was not merely the presence of that order that moved the poets to preach the things that bound them in their hearts to the work of the princeps. It is now suggested that at a time when the new elements were scarcely beginning to show themselves, not to speak of reaching their final form, they found their expression in the word of the poets.[1]

Grenier also has seen the relationship between the poets and the new age.

> . . . Poetry, above all, lent its lustre to the new patriotism and ensured its diffusion. The Muse defined Octavian's policy and placed herself at his service. Horace and Virgil were the heralds of this national reaction.[2]
>
> Cruelly though these hopes have been disappointed, this idea of the Roman Peace extending its blessings over the world is truly a great and noble conception. It was only an aspiration, no doubt, only an ideal, but it is all to the honour of the Roman people that they ever conceived it. It roused genuine enthusiasm in a whole generation, chiefly among humble, simple people, all those who were most helpless in the presence of public calamities and had the most to hope from a social rebirth. Virgil, the poet of shepherds and the son of peasants, gives this ideal a religious and miraculous colour. Earth, of herself, without labour, will offer her gifts to man; all ills, all perils will fade away; the lion will no more be the terror of the flocks; the serpent will die, the poisonous plants will die; there will be flowers and fruit everywhere. When Horace, in his skilfully chiselled lines, expresses the popular

---

[1]Altheim, pp. 383-384.

[2]Albert Grenier, The Roman Spirit in Religion, Thought, and Art (London: K. Paul, French, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1926), p. 293.

> feeling, he tries to make it clear in more realistic pictures. He finds the elements of them in the sights of country life and in the beautified memories of the past of Rome. The peace of Augustus is the ox cutting his furrow, the god Faunus going through the byres and folds and heaping his blessings on the beasts and their young, or the ploughman happily enjoying his supper in the midst of his family. It is also the revival of the glorious days of Romulus, Regulus, Fabius, Cato, the days when everyone, it was thought, had been wise and good, and the gods, content with the piety of the people, had given Rome unmingled glory.[1]

According to the Aeneid, it is destiny which ordains all things. From eternity it had been decided that the dominion of the world should be given to Rome, the heiress of Troy. Throughout the story the hero Aeneas is pictured as one who abandons himself wholly to the gods who direct and protect him. "The whole epic is dominated by a majestic finality, as flattering to Roman pride as it was consoling to the conquered."[2]

> With right, the Aeneid became the great national work, not only for Rome itself, but for the whole of the Graeco-Roman artistic tradition was gathered up in a new and living form, the memories of the old Republic were united with the noblest aspirations of the new Empire, the purest Latin patriotism was allied with a generous philosophy of Mediterranean history, Latium and Italy were extolled but reconciled with Africa while the origins of their glory were linked with Asia, and the practices of the old worship were associated with the mystical aspirations of contemporary religious feelings. In details of workmanship, the idealism and conventionalizing methods of great classical poetry were enhanced by realistic touches and minute accuracy, while the myth was studded with pictures of present-day life and localized in a fundamentally true landscape. By its very complexity, Virgil's epic answered to the most diverse tendencies of the individuals and peoples pacified and brought together by the Empire. It was truly the poem of Imperial Rome, the epic of the world and the new age.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 296-297.

[2] Ibid., p. 309.

[3] Ibid., p. 314.

Augustus, the true hero of the poets, was himself profoundly religious. According to Suetonius, the Princeps carried fear of the gods to the point of superstition. For defense against lightning Rome's First Citizen wore an amulet of seal's skin. Omens and auspices were seriously taken into account by him on all occasions.

> That the religious tendencies of Augustus were profoundly sincere cannot be doubted. That they were reinforced by a political purpose also appears evident. Augustus saw in religion one of the essential elements of Roman tradition, and he deliberately modelled his attitude on that of the old Roman magistrates. Like them, for example, he made a fundamental distinction between the official worships consecrated by Roman usage and innovations. He evinced profound respect for the former and disdained the latter. In Athens he had been initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries, but in Egypt he had refused to look at the ox Apis, and when his grandson travelled in Judea he congratulated him on having refrained from offering prayer in the Temple of Jerusalem.[1]

Thus it is that we find in the will of Augustus the record that he had caused eighty-two of the ancient temples to be repaired. He also elevated the dignity of the priestly offices and announced that had he a daughter he would have proudly made her a Vestal Virgin.

When the picture is fitted together, it seems evident that Augustus manifested to the Empire the ideals and the sense of divine mission which Cicero and the poets had expressed in writing. The Romans were brought to view themselves as the inheritors of all that was good in the past, in order that by virtue and diligence they might fulfil the will of the gods in establishing a universal realm of peace and justice. The two Hellenic types of human excellence, "that of the 'hero' and that of the 'citizen' were reconciled by Eternal Rome."[2] Plato and Aristotle had met together in the new Empire.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 373.

[2] Cochrane, p. 86.

In summary it might be said that:

> . . . despite the perils and uncertainties to which it gave rise, the crisis which issued in the principate may be regarded as, on the whole, a crisis of adjustment, during which men never quite lost faith in the possibility of conserving the essential elements of the classical heritage. This, indeed, was precisely the aim of Augustus; his work marks a herculean effort to solve the problems of his age in terms consistent with the thought and aspiration of classical antiquity. From this standpoint, his problem was to associate the notion of power with that of service and thus, at one and the same time, to justify the ascendancy of Rome in the Mediterranean and that of the Caesars in Rome. To see it in this light is not merely to credit the founder with a sincere desire to reconcile the new demands of empire with the ancient claims of civic freedom; it is also to discover the possibilities of Classicism as a basis for the good life in what has been characteristically described as the happiest and most prosperous period in the history of the human race.[1]

General Characteristics of the Empire

What was the external picture of Roman life in the first century? We would briefly sketch its characteristics under the headings of a positive set and a negative.

The first of the benevolent characteristics of the Empire was that of peace. The Pax Romana fulfilled mankind's ancient dream. The faction-fighting which had marked many of the Hellenistic cities was discontinued. As for the Mediterranean, it was a peaceful lake. The Roman army was reduced to a minimum, for Augustus decided against trying to extend the Empire by further wars.

Secondly, the triumph of Rome marked also the triumph of law and justice. Undoubtedly there were some governors who presumed on the basis of their powers, but these usually paid the ultimate price of

---

[1]Ibid., p. 3.

recall and disgrace. The world had never before known such widespread equity in legal and financial matters. Similarly, a public administration now existed which was uniquely efficient. This was accomplished, admittedly, by the emphasis of Augustus upon the stabilization of classes and their functions. The two citizen classes, the knights and the proletariat, had their ambitions and services predetermined for them. However, the senatorial and equestrian orders "were by no means closed castes; the way lay open to able and successful men for advancement from the lower to the higher grades."[1]

A corollary of the above was the new safety of life. Pirates and brigands were put down, and there were a freedom and security in travel that had been unknown before.

Ideas also were permitted comparatively free circulation. Undoubtedly Rome tended more to the Greek rather than the Oriental culture, but in the distant provinces of the east as elsewhere there was freedom to pursue local customs and to believe in local cults. As shall be noticed later, many of the Oriental religious ideas penetrated even the West.

The extension of Hellenic culture was another gift of the Empire. The famous line of Horace regarding the manner in which the conquered Greek took his masters captive is a true description of what actually occurred.

Finally, this list should include Rome's introduction of progress to hitherto backward nations. Britain and Gaul were led out of barbarism, the helots of Sparta were freed, and like transformations occurred throughout all the distant provinces. Particularly important was Rome's encouragement of city life, a feature later responsible for the development

---

[1]Arthur E. R. Boak, A History of Rome to 565 A.D. 4th ed. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 267.

of influential missionary centers of the early Christian church. Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, and Corinth ranked in importance with the city of Rome itself.

The negative set of characteristics of the Empire was in some cases the almost inevitable accompaniment of imperialism. For example, the captive races knew no self-determination. They were subjects of the Roman Empire, and along with their inheritance of the good came the realization that they were no longer free to shape their own national destinies. International rivalries bring their advantages as well as their drawbacks, but there was no scope for such competition in the first century A.D.

While there was a new honesty in financial matters wherever it could be enforced, there also existed some disastrous economic habits in the areas of trade and taxation. As the years went by, oppression by tax-collectors increased, robbing the vitality of provincial workers, although in the first century taxation in most places was still comparatively light. The extent of trade in luxuries from the East reached the amount of almost two million dollars a year. This much money went to the Orient, but little gold and silver travelled in the other direction.

The institution of slavery did not, of course, originate with the Roman Empire, but it is certain that the conquests which established the new rule multiplied the numbers of human beings in bondage in Italy particularly. This led to what Walbank calls "the complete stagnation of technique."[1] Slaves naturally did not have any incentive to make technological improvements. Furthermore, where labour was cheap it was natural that freemen should come to look down upon such occupations as could be discharged by menials. Worse still was the consequent

---

[1]F. W. Walbank, The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West (London: Cobbett Press, 1946), p. 27.

deterioration of character which accompanies a slave-system. In the section on morals this point will be elaborated.

Philosophy in the Graeco-Roman World

It is what men believe that inevitably shapes their institutions and habits. For this reason we would attempt to picture the intellectual climate of the Graeco-Roman world.

Philosophy was the particular gift of Greece to the Western world. With the inhabitants of the Aegean was born the conviction that human reason, efficiently directed, could arrive at the determination of truth. Such a concept stands in contrast to earlier Oriental concepts that truth came by way of supernatural revelation or that truth came by participation in cosmic processes.

Cicero is our most reliable witness regarding the major philosophies current in his age. Himself an eclectic, he had not only read widely, but in his youth he travelled to Athens to receive the best Greece had to offer. In his treatise on the gods he mentions the four Schools of philosophy of significance in his day. They are enunciated as follows: (1) The Epicureans, (2) the Stoics, (3) the Academics, (4) the Peripatetics.

The Peripatetics belonged to the School of Aristotle, but they had augmented their store by some Stoic concepts. Ultimately the Peripatetics were absorbed into Neo-Platonism. The Academics represented the School of Plato, but they also had made some significant additions. In Cicero's dialogue it is the skeptic Cotta who represents this group. Because the Peripatetics and the Academics were the least influential of these four Schools in the first century, we shall discuss the teachings of their founders before considering Stoicism and Epicureanism.

Plato

Of that unique man
Whose name is not to come from the lips of the wicked.
Theirs is not the right to praise him--
Him who first revealed clearly
By word and by deed
That he who is virtuous is happy.
Alas, not one of us can equal him.
Arist., Frag. 623 (Rose, 1870)[1]

Born at Athens 428-27 of a distinguished family, Plato was later educated in the traditions of the Periclean regime. He became a devoted disciple of Socrates. The latter might be called the founder of moral science, inasmuch as before his time philosophy had been largely physical, seeking for an explanation of nature. Thus it was from Socrates that Plato inherited many of the features which were to characterize his own system.

Like Socrates, Plato refused to believe the view of the Sophists that truth is relative. In the Theaetetus he challenges the theory of Protagoras that knowledge is perception, and that what appears to be truth to an individual may be such for him only. Typical of his arguments is that of Socrates in reply to the dictum of Protagoras that "Man is the measure of all things."

> He [Socrates] points out that the majority of mankind believe in knowledge and ignorance, and believe that they themselves or others can hold something to be true which in point of fact is not true. Accordingly, anyone who holds Protagoras' doctrine to be false is, according to Protagoras himself, holding the truth [i.e. if the man who is the measure of all things is the individual man.][2]

Plato predicted that true knowledge is a knowledge of universals not of sensible particulars. He believed that for every class of objects

---

[1]Frederick Copleston, A History of Philosophy (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1953) vol. 1, p. 261.

[2]Ibid., p. 145.

there also existed in the metaphysical realm a perfect "form" or "idea." It is this "idea" which is the true reality. The individual discernible objects of any particular class are temporary. They are mere shadows of the invisible perfect "idea." Thus, true knowledge is the result of rational appreciation of the spiritual rather than what is gained through the senses. The famous illustration of the cave brings us closer to Plato's meaning.

> Plato asks us to imagine an underground cave which has an opening towards the light. In this cave are living human beings, with their legs and necks chained from childhood in such a way that they face the inside wall of the cave and have never seen the light of sun. Above and behind them, i.e. between the prisoners and the mouth of the cave, is a fire, and between them and the fire is a raised way and a low wall, like a screen. Along that raised way there pass men carrying statues and figures of animals and other objects, in such a manner that the objects they carry appear over the top of the low wall or screen. The prisoners, facing the inside wall of the cave, cannot see one another nor the objects carried behind them, but they see the shadows of themselves and of these objects thrown on to the wall they are facing. They see only shadows.
>
> These prisoners represent the majority of mankind, that multitude of people who remain all their lives in a state of eíhasia, beholding only shadows of reality and hearing only echoes of the truth. Their view of the world is most inadequate, distorted by "their own passions and prejudices, and by the passions and prejudices of other people as conveyed to them by language and rhetoric." And though they are in no better case than children, they cling to their distorted views with all the tenacity of adults, and have no wish to escape from their prison-house. Moreover, if they were suddenly freed and told to look at the realities of which they had formerly seen the shadows, they would be blinded by the glare of the light, and would imagine that shadows were far more real than the realities.
>
> However, if one of the prisoners who has escaped grows accustomed to the light, he will after a time be able to look at the concrete sensible objects, of which he had formerly seen but the shadows. This man beholds his fellows in the light of the fire (which represents the visible sun) and is in a state of pistis having been "converted" from the shadow-world of eíhónes,

> prejudices and passions and sophistries, to the real world of zŏa, though he has not yet ascended to the world of intelligible, nonsensible realities. He sees the prisoners for what they are, namely prisoners, prisoners in the bonds of passion and sophistry. Moreover, if he perseveres and comes out of the cave into the sunlight, he will see the world of sun-illumined and clear objects (which represent intelligible realities), and lastly, though only by an effort, he will be able to see the sun itself, which represents the Idea of the Good, the highest Form, "the universal cause of all things right and beautiful--the source of truth and reason." He will then be in a state of noēsis . . .
>
> Plato remarks that if someone, after ascending to the sunshine, went back into the cave, he would be unable to see properly because of the darkness, and so would make himself "ridiculous"; while if he tried to free another and lead him up to the light, the prisoners, who love the darkness and consider the shadows to be true reality, would put the offender to death, if they could but catch him. Here we may understand a reference to Socrates, who endeavoured to enlighten all those who would listen and make them apprehend truth and reason, instead of letting themselves be misled by prejudice and sophistry.[1]

This illustration indicates that Plato believed that true progress is made through patient, enduring effort. He insisted therefore, on the importance of education by which the young might be trained to believe in the invisible but eternal realities. Particularly was such education vital for those who were to be statesmen.

As we study the moral theory of Plato, we find that along with Socrates he believed that the summum bonum was the development of virtue and the attainment to a knowledge of God. The "ideas" or "forms" of which Plato spoke so often were, after all, the "ideas" of God; and by becoming aware of these, men could become akin to Deity. Plato also believed in a future life and the immortality of the soul. Because of his emphasis upon the soul, the material body seemed to be

---

[1]Copleston, pp. 160-162.

disparaged; and this paved the way for the asceticism of offshoot Christian movements in the early centuries of our era.

It may be that Plato's weakness was history, for it is certain that despite the tragic end of the preceding Periclean age, he accepted that identification of virtue with knowledge made first by his master.

> In the Protagoras Socrates shows, as against the Sophist, that it is absurd to suggest that justice can be impious or piety unjust, so that the several virtues cannot be entirely disparate. Furthermore, the intemperate man is one who pursues what is really harmful to man while the temperate man pursues what is truly good and beneficial. Now, to pursue what is truly good and beneficial is wise, while to pursue what is harmful is foolish. Hence temperance and wisdom cannot be entirely disparate. Again, true valour or courage means, e.g. standing your ground in battle when you know the risks to which you are exposed; it does not mean mere foolhardiness. Thus courage can no more be separated from wisdom than can temperance. Plato does not, of course, deny that there are distinct virtues, distinguished according to their objects or the parts of the soul of which they are the habits; but all these distinct virtues form a unity; inasmuch as they are the expressions of the same knowledge of good and evil. The distinct virtues are, therefore, unified in prudence or the knowledge of what is truly good for man and of the means to attain that good. It is made clear in the Meno that if virtue is knowledge or prudence, it can be taught, and it is shown in the Republic that it is only the philosopher who has true knowledge of the food for man. It is not the Sophist, content with "popular" notions of virtue, who can teach virtue, but only he who has exact knowledge, i.e. the philosopher.[1]

This concept is an important feature of the Classical heritage. The classicists believed that man by his own resources could create a perfect world. Plato's insistence that true education would bring virtue as an inevitable accompaniment was to influence men through all succeeding centuries, and only the shocks of recent global wars have availed to shake faith in this concept.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 218-219.

It should also be pointed out here that while Plato apparently taught many principles that bordered on the later Christian teachings, in this matter of virtue and the possibility of transforming the nature of man by education he differed radically from Christianity. Paul and his associates taught the gospel of Christ, which declared that only the intervening grace of God could transform a man's bias towards evil. Furthermore, we should not endeavour to equate the life resulting from Socratic ethics with that which develops from the Christian heritage. Consider, for example, the implications of Socrates' frank and unashamed words concerning his desire for the young man Charmides.

> Oh rare! I caught a sight of the inwards of his garment, and took the flame, then I could no longer contain myself. I thought how well Cydias understood the nature of love, when, in speaking of a fair youth, he woos someone 'not to bring the fawn in the sight of the lion to be devoured by him', and I felt that I had been overcome by a sort of wild-beast appetite. But I controlled myself, and when he asked me if I knew the cure of the headache, I answered but with an effort, that I did know.[1]

As mentioned on page 26, Platonism as it existed in the first century A.D. was not identical with that of the fourth and third centuries B.C.

Plato's own evolution of thought with its final emphasis upon Orphic and Pythagorean teachings, and its strong religious and ethical tendencies, pointed the way in which Platonism was to develop. Members of the "Old Academy" largely dropped the doctrine of "Ideas," and like Pythagoras emphasized the mystic lore of numbers. This was followed by the switching of attention to religion and ethics. The "New Academy" stressed probability rather than idealism. Ultimately eclecticism became the universal practice; and the Neoplatonism in

---

[1]Cited by Wilbur M. Smith, Therefore Stand (Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1945), p. 238.

the time of the Empire was a synthesis of Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Aristoteleanism, and Stoicism, plus some elements from the Oriental cults.

In the first century A.D., Platonism, as such, had slight appeal. Only as fragments of it reappeared in Stoicism and other syncretistic systems did it have significant influence.

Aristotle

The son of the physician of the Macedonian king, Aristotle was born in Thrace in 384-3 B.C. At the age of seventeen he went to Athens and became a member of Plato's Academy. While in later years Aristotle's own scientific interests came more and more to the fore, the influence of the metaphysics of Plato never entirely left him.

In 343-2, Aristotle was entrusted with the educating of Alexander. When the latter ascended the throne, his tutor returned to Athens and founded his own school in the north-east sector of the city, at the Lyceum. This school was also known as the Peripotos and thus its members were called Peripotetikoi. A year after the death of Alexander the Great, Aristotle also died.

The writings of this philosopher fall into two groups, (1) the esoteric, and (2) the pedagogical works. Despite the emphasis upon the empirical and scientific, Aristotle ever retained his interests in metaphysics.

> Wisdom, therefore, deals with the first principles and causes of things, and so is universal knowledge in the highest degree. This means that it is the science which is furthest removed from the sense, the most abstract science, and so is the hardest of the sciences as involving the greatest effort of thought. "Sense-perception is common to all and therefore easy and no mark of Wisdom." But, though it is the most abstract of the sciences, it is, in Aristotle's view, the most exact of the sciences, "for those which involve fewer principles

> are more exact than those which involve additional principles, e.g. arithmetic than geometry." Moreover, this science is in itself the most knowable than their applications (for these depend on the first principles, and not vice versa), though it does not follow that they are the most knowable in regard to us, since we necessarily start with the things of sense and it requires a considerable effort of rational abstraction to proceed from what is directly known to us, sense-objects, to their ultimate principles.[1]

The ethics of Aristotle are teleological in nature. Whatever tends to the attainment of good on a man's part is "good." At the end of his Nicomachean Ethics he discusses the ideal life, and suggests that it is a life of conduct in accordance with virtue.

> . . . virtue, in Aristotle's eyes, is a mean between two extremes, the extremes being vices, one being a vice through excess, the other being a vice through defect. Through excess or defect of what? Either in regard to the feeling of confidence, the excess of this feeling constitutes rashness--at least when the feeling issues in action, and it is with human actions that ethics are concerned--while the defect is cowardice. The mean, then, will be a mean between rashness on the one hand and cowardice on the other hand: this mean is courage and is the virtue in respect to the feeling of confidence. Again, if we take the action of giving of money, excess in regard to this action is prodigality--and this is a vice--while defect in regard to this action is illiberality. The virtue, liberality, is the mean between the two vices, that of excess and that of defect. Aristotle, therefore, describes or defines moral virtue as "a disposition to choose, consisting essentially in a mean relatively to us determined by a rule, i.e. the rule by which a practically wise man would determine it."[2]

It is evident from this quotation that Aristotle clings to the Socratic concept that virtue and knowledge are linked. The two attributes when combined would make man an effectual "political animal" as well as a happy individual. Little wonder, then, that when the great Roman

---

[1]Copleston, p. 288.

[2]Ibid., p. 336.

poets depicted the role of the Empire, it was with emphasis upon these two features as the ideals which could implement a Utopia. Virgil and Horace were both students of the writings of the ancient Greeks and entirely familiar with the emphases of Plato and Aristotle.

Nevertheless, Aristoteleanism as such, like Platonism, had little impact upon the first century A.D. After the philosopher's death, his treatises were lost for over two hundred years; and as a result the Peripatetic school rapidly forgot the spirit of its master and developed a logical tradition of its own. Some influential teachers in the Lyceum swung far away from their master in certain teachings. Aristoxenus denied the immortality of the intellect, and Strato repudiated the existence of God. A gradual division of scientific effort also characterized post-Aristotelian philosophy. Even when the works of Aristotle were recovered (80 B.C.), they were regarded more as a body of complete knowledge than as a stimulus to inquiry.

Aristotelianism affected classical antiquity much less than did the tradition of Plato, and during the time of the development and stabilization of the Empire it was the Latin poets who expressed far more of the sentiments of the age than did its philosophers.

The Epicurean and Stoic contemporaries of the classical poets, however, looked in other directions. It is these two schools which are particularly mentioned in the New Testament, and this alone is indicative of the pre-eminence assumed by them in the first century.[1]

Epicureanism

After Aristotle, the tendency to speculation declined, and philosophy became more practical in essence. Virtue and happiness

---

[1]See Acts 17.

were its themes, and the problem of human life on earth was the basis of discussion. Religious questions, including those of providence and the existence of evil, came to the fore. There was a new stress upon the significance of the individual. When we look for the causes of this changed direction, it seems apparent that the political revolutions of the times as described earlier were responsible. The collapse of the Greek political communities, the conquests of Alexander, the new familiarity between East and West with consequent fusion--all these contributed to the change in the mode of thinking. No longer did the old political systems appear as the center of man's life. At this time, the emphasis given by Socrates to ethical inquiry was reaffirmed.

Epicurus was born a generation later than Aristotle in 341 B.C. Early in his experience he studied under the followers of Plato and Democritus, but by 307 B.C. he had opened his own School at Athens. While Epicurus was a voluminous writer, only fragments of his work remain. It is in the Latin poet Lucretius (91-51 B.C.) that we have the populariser for the Roman world of the thought of the Aegean philosopher. The many extant manuscripts of the poet witness to the wide-spread favor he received in his own day.

For Epicurus, life's main concern was Ethics. Even his theories of physics were significant only in so far as they subserved the principles of the conduct of life. He believed that all knowledge came via the senses, and that the ultimate reality in the universe was matter. In effect his scheme amounted to practical atheism. While he believed in the gods, they were beings who in no wise influenced the world. It is the atomic theory of Democritus, asserted Epicurus, not the gods, which explains the origin of the universe. To this philosopher, the first fundamental criterion of truth is Perception, and the second is provided by Concepts or memory-images. The third criterion grows

logically out of the preceding. It is the feelings which afford criteria for conduct. The feeling of pleasure indicates what we should choose, while the feeling of pain warns us as to what should be avoided. Thus Epicurus could say that "the criteria of truth are the senses, and the preconceptions, and the passions."[1]

Superstition was the great enemy of mankind, according to Epicurus and his followers.

> Lucretius says, "He (Epicurus) passed on far beyond the flaming walls of the world and traversed throughout in mind and spirit the immeasurable universe whence he returns a conqueror to tell us what can and what cannot come into being; in short, on what principle each thing has its powers defined, its deepest boundary mark. Therefore religion (as popularly understood) is put under foot and trampled upon in turn; his victory brings us level with heaven."[2]

Superstitious fears interfere with peace of mind and prevent pleasure, which is the true good, says this philosopher. Such an assertion made it inevitable that, like other founders of thought, Epicurus be often misconstrued. He neither urged or himself practiced extreme sensual or licentious conduct.

> The question then arises what Epicurus understands by pleasure, when he makes it the end of life. Two facts are to be noted: first, that Epicurus meant, not the pleasures of the moment, individual sensations, but the pleasure which endures throughout a lifetime; and secondly, that pleasure for Epicurus consisted rather in the absence of pain than in positive satisfaction. This pleasure is to be found pre-eminently in serenity of soul (ē tēs psuchēs ataraxia). With this serenity of soul Epicurus conjoined also health of body, but the emphasis is rather on intellectual pleasure, for, while very severe bodily pains are of short duration, less severe pains may be overcome or rendered endurable by intellectual pleasures. ". . . A correct theory . . .

---

[1]Copleston, p. 403. Diog. Laert., 10, 31.

[2]Shirley Jackson Case, The Evolution of Early Christianity (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927), pp. 258-259.

> can refer all choice and avoidance to the health of the body and the freedom from disquietude of the soul." ". . . at times we pass over many pleasures when any difficulty is likely to ensue from them; and we think many pains better than pleasures when a greater pleasure follows them, if we endure the pain for a time."[1]

Some aspects of the moral teaching of Epicurus were less selfish or egocentric than the theoretical foundations of his ethic might indicate. For instance, he believed it was more pleasant to do a kindness than to receive one. With the passing of years, however, it was inevitable that many who called themselves Epicureans should practice their philosophy on a lower level. The masses could understand better the concessions implied by this philosophy rather than its somewhat demanding ideals. When Montesquieu asserts that some of the corruption of the Roman world in the first century could be attributed to the spread of Epicureanism, he is not without supporters.[2] "The founders of this school led virtuous lives, but the doctrine contained no motives of sufficient power to restrain in the passions of men generally, and, in the progress of time, showed its real tendencies."[3]

> The extent to which Epicureanism pervaded the Graeco-Roman world in the first century A.D. is difficult now to determine. The school certainly maintained itself on down to the fourth century of our era. It doubtless had a considerable following still in the first century, for no other sect stood so positively by its original tenets, refusing to yield to the eclectic tendencies prevalent in that age. It continued to be the relentless foe of superstition, as we learn in the second century

---

[1]Copleston, p. 407.

[2]Montesquieu, Considerations on the Causes of the Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans, trans. by Jehu Baker (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1882), p. 197.

[3]George P. Fisher, The Beginnings of Christianity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877), p. 162. Hereafter referred to as Beginnings.

> when Lucian makes the Epicureans bitter enemies of the charlatan Alexander. Probably its greatest religious significance lies in its severe protest against popular superstition, it being in this respect the precursor of Christianity. But the Epicurean method of removing the malady proved quite inadequate for popular needs. . . .[1]

The records of history indicate that it was the philosophies of Epicureanism and Stoicism particularly which undermined the belief of influential Romans in the classical system of values. The result was a paralysis of community spirit and its consequent contribution to the deterioration of the Empire.

Stoicism

This was the most influential and popular of all philosophical systems in the first century A.D. Seneca (4-65 A.D.), Epictetus (60-110 A.D.), and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (121-180 A.D.) were able representatives of Stoicism in the early days of Christianity.

Zeno, the founder of the early Stoic school, was a contemporary of Epicurus, but he was not a Greek. He was born in Cyprus about 336-35 B.C., and came to Athens about 315-313 B.C. He became successively the admirer of Socrates and of Crates the Cynic, and then in the year 300 B.C. Zeno established his own school. According to tradition he committed suicide about 264-3 B.C. at Athens.

> In order to form a correct conception of Stoicism we must remember (1) that it is not merely a philosophy and a system of ethics, but a religion raised upon the ruins of popular polytheism; (2) that its founder and its most ardent disciples trace their origin either to Semitic Asia or to Roman Italy; (3) that it is not the work of a single individual, but a collection of doctrines from different sources which meet in one and the same channel like the tributaries of a river. Hence its conservatism in religion and its dogmatism in metaphysics. Hence also its practical turn, and, finally, the complex and wholly eclectic nature of its teachings.[2]

---

[1]Case, p. 262.

[2]Alfred Weber, History of Philosophy, trans. by Frank Thilby (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), p. 141.

Lightfoot compares the systems of Epicurus and Zeno thus:

> Stimulated by the same need, Epicurus and Zeno strove in different ways to solve the problem which the perplexities of their age presented. Both alike, avoiding philosophy in the proper sense of the term, concentrated their energies on ethics: but the one took happiness, the other virtue, as his supreme good, and made it the starting-point of his ethical teaching. Both alike contrasted with the older masters in building their systems on the needs of the individual and not of the state: but one strove to satisfy the cravings of man, as a being intended by nature for social life, by laying stress on the claims and privileges of friendship, the other by expanding his sphere of duty and representing him as a citizen of the world or even of the universe. Both alike paid a certain respect to the waning beliefs of their day: but the one without denying the existence of the gods banished them from all concern in the affairs of men, while the other, transforming and utilizing the creations of Hellenic mythology, identified them with the powers of the physical world. Both alike took conformity to nature as their guiding maxim: but nature with the one was interpreted to mean the equable balance of all the impulses and faculties of man, with the other the absolute supremacy of the reason, as the ruling principle of his being. And lastly; both alike sought refuge from the turmoil and confusion of the age of the inward calm and composure of the soul. If Serenity (átaraxia) was the supreme virtue of the one, her twin sister Passionlessness (ápathia) was the sovereign principle of the other.[1]

We shall concern ourselves chiefly with Stoicism as it was in the days of Seneca, remembering that this is a modification of the earlier Stoicism of Zeno and Chrysippus.

The Stoicism of the first century A.D. was a form of pantheistic materialism. Plato's "forms" are emphatically rejected. Mind and body are simply two aspects of one and the same reality. As for the universe, it is a living being, it is God, and it governs our destinies. "The world, proceeding by evolution from the primitive fire, eventually returns to its source through a universal conflagration, and the

---

[1]J. B. Lightfoot, Dissertations on the Apostolic Age (London: Macmillan and Company, 1882), pp. 251-252.

same process is to be renewed in an endless series of cycles."[1]

Because every man is a part of Deity, the chief end of his existence is virtuous living. Virtue is conformity to the Will of the Universe, and in the Logos, divine Reason, is to be found the common bond uniting all mankind. "Since God is thus the father of all, all men are brothers, and all class distinctions are only artificial barriers to be removed by religion rather than by social revolution."[2] Stoicism asserts that the truly wise man will show little concern for apparently unfavourable circumstances, for these are transitory, and viewed in the context of all time, they are in reality benevolent. According to Seneca, whatever happens is to be accepted as a revelation of the divine will. Thus the way to freedom is the attainment of virtue by the will's acquiescence to all of life's disturbances.

> Happy is the sage, who, versed in the secrets of nature, knows himself and others; whom this knowledge frees from the guardianship of men, the times, social prejudices, and the laws themselves, in so far as they are the products of human caprice and not of reason. . . . He alone is truly free; he has overcome the world as well as his own passions. Nothing can affect him nor make him falter; neither the happenings of the world nor the storms in his own heart. Let come what come may, he is resigned; for everything is decreed by Nature and Fate; and Nature and Fate are synonymous with Reason, Providence, and good Will. Hence, the supreme rule which he observes in all things: sequi naturam, to follow nature, that is, the law which is identical with the law that governs the world. . . .[3]

The serenity aimed at by the Stoic could be attained only by eradicating the passions as much as possible. Such a belief was the logical consequence of the determination to follow Reason.

---

[1]Fisher, p. 162.

[2]Case, p. 269.

[3]Weber, p. 146.

Thus mirth, sorrow, anger, and their kindred are weaknesses of which a good Stoic should be ashamed, but for the fact that the feeling of shame is unstoical and is therefore also to be eschewed.

> When the Stoic directed his gaze toward the future, he again found himself at variance with popular tradition. Of hell and its terrors he had no fear. These morbid fancies were held to be impossible for the philosopher who did not believe in any black darkness awaiting the dead--"there is no prison house, no lake of fire or river of forgetfulness, no judgment, no renewal of the rule of tyrants." The fate of man's soul after death is determined by the nature of the soul's constitution. Since it is a part of the ethereal substance called the divine mind, or God, it must be immortal in the same sense that divine substance is immortal. This fundamental notion left room for wide variations of opinion as to the different stages in the soul's career.[1]

The belief in the common brotherhood of man led the Stoics to entertain many benevolent and humanitarian ideals. These come very close to the maxims of Christianity. Probably such ethics owed their origin more to the Socratic Schools than to the Stoic physical and metaphysical theories. Typical of Seneca's statements regarding the social relations of man are the following:

> You must live for another, if you would live for yourself.
>
> For what purpose do I get myself a friend? That I may have one for whom I can die, one whom I can follow into exile, one whom I can shield from death at the cost of my own life.
>
> I will so live, as if I knew that I was born for others, and will give thanks to nature on this score.
>
> They are slaves, you urge; nay, they are men. They are slaves; nay, they are comrades. They are slaves; nay, they are humble friends. They are slaves; nay, they are fellow-slaves, if you reflect that fortune has the same power over both. Let some of them dine with you, because they are worthy; others, that may become worthy.

---

[1]Case, p. 276.

> He is a slave, you say. Yet perchance he is free in spirit. He is a slave. Will this harm him? Show me who is not. One is a slave to lust, another to avarice, a third to ambition, all alike to fear.[1]

Concerning many parallels which exist between statements from Seneca and others from the New Testament, Lightfoot has written:

> The first impression made by this series of parallels is striking. They seem to show a general coincidence in the fundamental principles of theology and the leading maxims in ethics: they exhibit moreover special resemblances in imagery and expression, which, it would seem, cannot be explained as the result of accident, but must point to some historical connexion.
>
> Nevertheless a nearer examination very materially diminishes the force of this impression. In many cases, where the parallels are most close, the theory of a direct historical connexion is impossible; in many others it can be shown to be quite unnecessary; while in not a few instances the resemblance, however striking, must be condemned as illusory and fallacious.[2]

Possibly in Seneca we have an illustration of the fact that Stoicism while high-sounding in theory was somewhat less in practice.

> Seneca was a despicable man. . . . he was a cowardly man, and in consequence an odious flatterer; and he used his position to acquire enormous riches, a fact which made his perpetual references to the simple life academic, even though he did not live a self-indulgent life himself. Having flattered Claudius as long as he lived, he lost no time, after the Emperor's death, in writing a funny but spiteful skit on his experience in Hades. In fact Seneca had great talent but no sincerity. . . .[3]

Beyond all doubt, examples could be multiplied of those who failed to abide by the Christian philosophy espoused in the same century, but the evidence indicates that Christianity generally brought with it a moral power and motivation that transcended Stoicism and all other contemporary philosophy or religions.

---

[1]Lightfoot, p. 263.

[2]Ibid., pp. 272-273.

[3]Lawrence Waddy, Pax Romana and World Peace (London: Chapman and Hall, 1950), p. 211.

> The Greek Sophia was entirely devoid of power over the will and heart of mankind. It remained purely theoretical and abstract: it could do nothing for men, it was the property of a few, and had no effect, or a miserably inadequate effect on the life and character of those few. Where it did to some degree touch the heart and affect the life of some rare individual, it produced a philosophic and affected prig rather than a true man; and in the case of some of its most elegant exponents, such as Seneca, there was a woeful contrast in spirit between their words and their life.[1]

The relationship between the fundamental premises of the prominent schools of philosophy and the higher ethics sometimes inculcated was actually a fragile one. There were unresolved contradictions within the basic theories. For example, while Epicureanism saw the folly of seeking after the short-term pleasures and inculcated, instead, long term gratifications, this was done with the awareness that life's brevity might cheat man at last. The greater the "long view" of pleasures, the greater the threat from nature that the realization of these joys might be interrupted. Such uncertainty could not but contribute to the paralysis of the moral life, for no argument exists to convince the unbeliever in immortality that death is a long-term pleasure.

The following words apply not only to the Greeks but also to the Roman devotees of Epicureanism and Stoicism.

> In the Greek Anthology, Hope and Fortune are two companion goddesses who make a sport of human life. The future indeed hung like a heavy cloud over the ancient world, charged with catastrophes, reversals of fortune, the wreck of states, the breaking up of homes, exile and death. In the face of these uncertainties the virtue of the Greeks was Resignation rather than Hope, a cheerful acceptance of the gods' will, without any joyful or assured anticipations.[2]

---

[1]Smith, p. 237.

[2]Ibid., p. 243.

Those in the first century who had the greatest insight into the significance of the basic postulates of the current philosophies are also to be numbered among the most pessimistic of all thinkers.

Concluding the review of this phase of men's thought in the first century, we would repeat that philosophy was not then a great force. While it is true that many elements reappeared in syncretistic creeds, for the most part the chief Greek philosophies had been relegated to the background by the pressures of scepticism, sterility, and materialism. Abstract thought had little appeal for the proletariat, and most Roman aristocrats preferred to listen to the verses of Horace and Livy rather than concentrate upon the somewhat involved doctrine of Plato or Aristotle, or, to a lesser extent, of Zeno or Epicurus.

Nevertheless, the philosophy of the age had several significant historical functions to perform as indicated in the following reference.

> The Greek Philosophy was a preparation for Christianity in three ways. It dissipated, or tended to dissipate, the superstitions of polytheism; it awakened a sense of need which philosophy of itself failed to meet; and it so educated the intellect and conscience as to render the Gospel apprehensible, and, in many cases, congenial to the mind. It did more than remove obstacles out of the way; its work was positive as well as negative. It originated ideas and habits of thought which had more or less direct affinity with the religion of the Gospel, and which found in this religion their proper counterpart. The prophetic element of the Greek philosophy lay in the glimpses of truth which it could not fully discern, and in the obscure and unconscious pursuit of a good which it could not definitely grasp.[1]

Religion in the Graeco-Roman World

Some general comments regarding Roman religion have been made in the discussion concerning the motivation which lay behind the new

---

[1]Fisher, p. 140.

order of Augustus. We shall now consider in some detail the nature of the official religion of Rome, and the spreading international faiths, with particular emphasis upon Judaism and Christianity.

Early forms of religion in the Italian peninsula were animistic in nature. All natural forces and processes were viewed as the expression of the activity of supernatural spirits.

> These spirits were incalculable, impersonal, forces. The Romans called them numina, and so we might use the term "numinism" to describe Roman animism. When such numina were thought of as personalities with definite names they became "gods", dei, and this stage of religious development is called "deism". Because the primitive Roman gods were the spirits of an earlier age, for a long time the Romans worshipped them without images or temples. But each divinity was regarded as residing in a certain locality and only there could his worship be conducted. The true Roman gods lacked human attributes: their power was admitted but they inspired no personal devotion. Consequently the Romans had no cosmogony or mythology of their own and Roman theology consisted in the knowledge of these deities and their powers and of the ceremonial acts necessary to influence them.[1]

The practical Romans viewed religion as a system of contractual relations. The idea of loving their gods would never have occurred to them for they worshipped, not in order to be made good, but to be made prosperous. Ritual, therefore, occupied a place of primary importance, and success or failure in the projects of life was believed to depend upon faithfulness in religious ritual. Sacrifice was the essential of ritual, but usually it was the offering of fruits and grains, rather than of blood.

> It is in the cult of the household that we can best see the true Roman religious ideas. The chief divinities of the household were: Janus, the spirit of the doorway; Vesta, the spirit of the fire on the hearth; the Penates, the guardian spirits of the store-chamber; the Lar Familiaris, which we may perhaps

---

[1]Boak, p. 71.

> regard as the spirit of the cultivated land transplanted within the house to be the guardian of the family fortune; and the Genius or guardian spirit of the life of the family as a whole, later associated with the head of the household as his spiritual double. Besides these numina there were many others which were considered to be in control of the manifold aspects of the life of the household and its individual members including birth, marriage, and death. Although the male head of the household may be regarded as its priest, the worship of certain of the powers revered within the house was carried out by his wife and daughters.[1]

Besides the cult of the household, the public or state cult should also be considered. The calendar traditionally attributed to Numa probably represents the first attempt to systematize the old religion, and it can be dated about the time of the beginning of the Republic.

> At this stage the state religion was that of an essentially agricultural community and consisted mainly in the performance of certain rites of the household and of the farm by or for the people as a whole. The state cults of Vesta and the Penates, as well as the festival of the Ambarvalia, the annual solemn purification of the fields, were of this nature. But, in addition, the state religion included the worship of a number of divinities whose personalities and powers were conceived of with greater distinctness than the numina venerated in the house and in the fields. The chief place among these gods was held originally by the triad Mars, Jupiter, and Quirinus, but by the time of the dedication of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill (508 B.C.) these had given way to a new triad: Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. Jupiter Optimus Maximus, called also Capitolinus from his place of worship, was originally a god of the sky, but adorned with other attributes was finally revered as the chief protecting divinity of the Roman state. Juno was the female counterpart of Jupiter and was the great patron goddess of women. Minerva, as we have seen, was the patroness of craftsmen. Mars, originally a god of agriculture as well as of war, became in the state cult of the Republic essentially the patron deity of warlike, "martial," activities and gave his name to the military training ground of Rome, the Campus Martius or Field of Mars.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 72-73.

[2] Ibid., pp. 73-76.

Through the state-worship, foreign religions first became significant in Italy. Someone has said that Rome was as anxious to conquer gods as cities, and it is certain that hospitality rather than hostility was early offered to the gods of foreigners. Gods absorbed through war were added to those of native Italy and those that had been introduced by the Greek colonists of Southern Italy in the eighth century. Ultimately the Romans set up the College of Pontifices to regulate religion and ritual. The Pontifices were religious magistrates who adjusted the calendar every year, and organized the festivals. To them also fell the duty of deciding regarding the admission of foreign gods and where new temples and their priests should be established. One important priestly college of Rome was that of the augurs, who were specialists in interpreting omens and in divination.

It is also important to notice the influence of Greek mythology upon Roman religion.

> Rome was early brought into intercourse with the old Greek cities of Southern Italy, which at length were incorporated under her rule. In the time of the Tarquins, the Sibylline books, which explained the rites proper to be practised in exigencies not provided for by the ordinary ritual, were introduced from Cumae. Also, the worship of Apollo was brought from this oldest of the Greek settlements, and acquired a constantly increasing influence until at length this Greek god, whose healing power was supposed to go forth upon the body and the spirit, received honors second only to those paid to Jupiter. In early times, the Romans had resorted to the oracle at Delphi for counsel; and after the capture of Veii, they sent there a votive offering. Recognizing the Greeks as kinsmen, and identifying the Hellenic divinities with their own, they incorporated into their creed the myths and legends of the Greek mythology, and, more and more, elements of the cultus associated with them. This fusion went on at a rapid pace in the two or three centuries that immediately preceded the Christian era.[1]

---

[1]Fisher, pp. 123-124.

Undoubtedly many widely-travelled and philosophical Romans had become sceptical concerning the popular religion by the time of Augustus. But this should not be construed as signifying that their attitude had spread to the greater number of the people. Such was not the case. Most of the populace

> . . . had at home, in their houses and in their fields, gods whom they knew, invoked, feared, or loved. Between the individual religion of the thinkers and the official worship there was a popular religion made up of the simple fancies, the pious traditions, the earnestness, and the emotion natural to man in the presence of the unknown. It formed the deep stratum which, even among the most highly cultivated, was always cropping up at some point. On this popular religion Augustus based, at least in part, his national restoration.[1]

> The form and the vitality of this religious sentiment are chiefly revealed to us by the recent discovery at Delos of a number of monuments of family worship belonging to the Roman colony which settled in the island in the first half of the Ist century B.C. These modest monuments agree, in general, with the information supplied by many paintings from Pompeii, most of which date only from the Ist century A.D., and are therefore later than the Augustan restoration. They thus form a link in the chain which connects the religion of the Imperial epoch with that of the early centuries of Rome, and, as such, are of quite special interest.[2]

The great influx of religious and philosophical ideas from the East did not confuse the great majority of the Romans.

> Beneath the brilliant but superficial facing of cosmopolitan intellectual life, beneath the more vulgar stratum of Graeco-Oriental mysticism complicated by magic and astrology, we must not forget the profound, vigorous life of the mass of the Italian people. History, being wholly aristocratic and political, hardly noticed them. For they lived outside history, so to speak, content to be alive under a sunny sky, on a land which they loved. They needed no more than a few very simple ideas inherited from

---

[1]Grenier, The Roman Spirit, pp. 366-367.

[2]Ibid., p. 367.

> their forefathers and a few homely rites to give them confidence and joy. A loyal, courageous race, feeling no dread in the presence of the unknown and, at bottom, not caring much about it, when the thoughts and fancies of the Mediterranean came pouring in they kept alive the original conceptions and religious acts of the first masters of the Italian soil. At the unextinguished fire of their humble altars the religion of Imperial Rome was rekindled.[1]

The cult of Emperor worship also had its beginnings in the first century, but its prominence was reserved for a later period.

The Oriental Religions

The Roman conquests in the East had the result of reinforcing the inroads that oriental cults had already made in Italy. They offered men personal fellowship with personal deities, and gave promise of immortality. Most of the influential cults were mystery religions with elaborate rituals of initiation and worship which appealed to the senses and to the emotions.

At first the Roman government was tolerant of the new beliefs and interfered only when orgiastic practices interfered with Roman conceptions of morality. During the last century of the Republic, the Senate endeavoured to drive the cult of Isis from Rome, but in 42 B.C. the triumvirs erected a temple to this goddess. Augustus banished Isis worship, but by 70 A.D. it had become re-established in Rome.

First in time came the worship of the Great Mother of Pessinus, also known as Cybele. Believed to be the source of all life in nature, like Demeter, her rites correspondingly were orgiastic in character. Attis, her consort, personified the death and resurrection of nature in winter and spring. The myth tells of his dying by self-multilation,

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 271-272.

and the goddess mourns until he is revived. On the basis of this belief was established a ritual by which believers could also attain to a similar victory over death. The cult was familiar to the Greeks by the sixth century B.C., but it was not until 204 B.C. that the worship of Cybele was introduced into Italy. The occasion was one of crises during the conflict with Hannibal. After the sacred stone of Pessinus was solemnly installed on the Palatine, the Romans achieved victory over Carthage, and the position of Cybele seemed henceforth secure. It was not, however, until the first century A.D. that her worship really thrived in Rome. Other cults such as that of the Babylonian Ishtar, the Phoenician Ashtart, and the Greek Aphrodite duplicated many of the essential features of the Magna Mater worship. Similar duplication is found in such parallels as the Greek counterparts of Isis, Osiris, and Horus, namely Demeter, Dionysus, and Apollo.

Isis and Osiris were the chief figures in the mysteries of Egypt. Their myth is somewhat similar to that of Cybele and Attis, involving the story of death, mourning, and resurrection. Serapis, who is often associated with Isis, may have been identical with Osiris.

> The Isiac worship had conquered the Greek world before it became a power in Italy. In the fourth century B.C. traders from the Nile had their temple of Isis at the Peiraeus; in the third century the worship had been admitted within the walls of Athens. About the same time the goddess had found a home at Ceos, and Delos, at Smyrna and Halicarnassus, and on the coasts of Thrace.[1]

For seven centuries from the time of its importation into Athens the worship of Isis prospered in Europe. It probably arrived in Italy through the ports of Campania and there are indications that a temple

---

[1]Samuel Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius (London: Macmillan and Company, 1925), pp. 560-561.

of Serapis existed at Puteoli as early as 150 B.C. Similarly, the temple of Isis destroyed in the earthquake of 63 A.D. was established about the beginning of the first century B.C.

> The cult of Isis had indeed very various attractions for different minds. But for the masses, slaves, freedmen, and poor working people, its great fascination lay in the pomp of its ritual, and the passionate emotion aroused by the mourning for the dead Osiris, and his joyful restoration. It is this aspect of the worship which is assailed and ridiculed by the Christian apologists of the reign of Alexander Severus and of the reign of Constantine. The goddess, one of whose special functions was the care of mothers in childbirth, appealed especially to female sensibility. As in the cult of Magna Mater, women had a prominent place in her services and processions, and records of these sacred dignities appear on the monuments of great Roman ladies down to the end of the Western Empire. The history of a great religious movement in conflict with a reactionary conservatism, of cosmopolitan feeling arrayed against old Roman sentiment.[1]

The Oriental cult destined to become the most important was that of Mithraism. This religion had an Iranian origin. Mithra, in Zoroastrian theology, was the agent of the god of light against the god of darkness. As a result of Babylonian and Greek influence, Mithra later was identified with the Sun-god. Dill says of Mithraism that:

> It is perhaps the highest and most striking example of the last efforts of paganism to reconcile itself to the great moral and spiritual movement which was setting steadily, and with growing momentum, towards purer conceptions of God, of man's relations to Him, and of the life to come. It is also the greatest effort of syncretism to absorb, without extinguishing, the gods of the classic pantheon in a cult which was almost monotheistic, to transform old forms of nature worship and cosmic symbolism into a system which should provide at once some form of moral discipline and real satisfaction for spiritual wants.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 564-565.

[2] Ibid., p. 585.

By the end of the first century A.D. Mithraism had become influential in Rome. Mithra was known as the god of battles and thus became a patron deity of the legions. It is impossible to ascertain the exact time when this cult was introduced into Italy but a passage from Plutarch's life of Pompey indicates its existence in the West in 70 B.C. Not until the second and third centuries, however, did Mithraism become a serious rival of Christianity. At that time "Mithra, the Unconquered, the god of many lands, and dynasties from the dawn of history was a fascinating power. But, at his best, he belonged to the order which was vanishing."[1]

> Such, in broad outlines, were the redemption-religions of the Graeco-Roman world. In details they exhibit varying characteristics, but they all alike seek to meet the widespread demand for an individual salvation to be procured primarily by the aid of the deity. The demand for this type of religion was particularly strong in Hellenistic times, when national ideals were disappearing and the individual was thrown more specifically upon his own resources in a vast and varied world. The human spirit, conscious of its frailty and helpless at the loss of older sanctions, eagerly turned toward those cults which offered a personal salvation based upon a divine redemptive transaction. Among the oriental religions of redemption which attempted to meet this situation, Christianity was the last to arise, but it ultimately triumphed over all its rivals.[2]

Ancient tradition suggests that even the Druid worship which penetrated the western lands of Britain, Gaul, Spain, etc., had its origin in the Orient. Characteristic of the Druids was the practice of nature worship and the belief in the transmigration of souls.

The very popularity of these Oriental mystery religions among the Romans reveals the soul-hunger of the times. The State religion with its formalism and remoteness supplied little for the emotions or

---

[1]Ibid., p. 626.

[2]Case, p. 330.

deep longings of men. Even the protest of Augustus against such worship as that of Isis proved ineffectual, and steadily most of the mystery cults grew in strength. To consider the common features of most of the cults, emotional appeal and preoccupation with the fate of the soul etc., is to become aware of the spirit of stultification, uncertainty, and dissatisfaction which prevailed in the Empire. It was this spirit which presaged the shattering of the classical dream, and which suggested the readiness with which a religion such as Christianity might be accepted.

Judaism

When the first century is considered from the viewpoint of our own age, possibly neither the Greek or the Roman was the most important racial type of his day. The ubiquitous Jew has overshadowed them both in terms of influence. From this despised race came the primary elements and the progenitors of Christianity.

Strict monotheists, and possessors of a revelation and a history they believed to be supernatural, the Jews did not share the syncretistic tendencies of their neighbours. Instead, they shared with a hungry world their own belief in a coming Messiah. In the days of Augustus Caesar, synagogue scholars in every part of the world were pointing to the prophecies of their sacred Scriptures and declaring it was time for the promised Sun of Righteousness to dawn upon the world. Had not the ninth chapter of Daniel the prophet foretold that at the close of the seventy weeks of years from the rebuilding of the Temple (457 B.C.) the Messiah would come? Had not Haggai foretold that the glory of the rebuilt Temple would be greater than that of Solomon's because the "Desire of all Nations" would stand within its precincts? So the scribes affirmed.

In Palestine itself, independence from Greek rule had been secured following the Maccabean rebellion against Antiochus Epiphanes in the second century B.C. By 60 B.C., however, the country was under Roman control. Herod Antipater was the first of a line of kings which was to govern parts of Palestine for over a century. After a rebellion in A.D. 6 against Archelaeus, one of the sons of Herod the Great, Judea and Samaria were henceforth governed by a Roman procurator whose headquarters were at Caesarea.

Never did the Jews of Palestine take kindly to Roman rule. The Zealot party represented most strongly the Jewish hatred for the foreign overlords. Constantly these rabid nationalists endeavoured to stir up rebellion, and they were not without some success in such projects. The climax came in A.D. 70, when the Temple was destroyed by Titus during the siege of Jerusalem.

Other influential Jewish parties included the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. The last-named was an ascetic sect which lived in small monastic communities. Representative of these was the group who dwelled at the northwest shore of the Dead Sea and whose library was discovered in 1947. The Pharisees were the conservative interpreters of the Torah and responsible for the line of Rabbis who produced the Midrash and the Talmud. Next in importance to these religious leaders of Israel were the aristocratic Sadducees, who possessed the priestly offices. While the Pharisees found their following among the village peasants, the Sadducees claimed the wealthier classes. Naturally, the two parties constantly vied with one another.

The Diaspora which resulted in the far-flung synagogue system began in the eighth century B.C., when Assyrian armies transported multitudes of Jews to the far East. Other migrations followed in the

third and second centuries B.C. During the former many moved to Alexandria, and during the latter large numbers settled northward around Antioch and in Cilicia. In 63 B.C. Pompey brought back to Rome a host of Jewish captives. Adventurous Jewish colonists spread to every part of the Empire, and in our day the existence of over one hundred and fifty such communities has been traced. These colonies never lost their allegiance to Jerusalem and all for which the city stood, and even in foreign lands they successfully proselytized. Josephus could boast that:

> Among the masses there has long been much zeal for our religion; nor is there any city, Greek or barbarian, nor a single nation where the custom of our seventh day of rest from labour has not come into vogue; and the fasts and the lamp-lightnings and many of our prohibitions regarding food are observed.[1]

The philosopher Seneca complained that: "So far has the usage of the accursed race prevailed that it is now received throughout all lands; the conquered have given laws to the conquerors."[2]

Nevertheless, the Jews themselves in many areas had been greatly influenced by Hellenistic culture but "whatever the Jews took over from the Greeks was in form only, not in essence."[3] It was at Alexandria that the Jews came the closest to merging with surrounding cultures. Here an unorthodox type of Jewish theology arose which was a curious blend of the Old Testament with Platonic philosophy. Philo, born about 20 B.C., was the principal exponent of this school. Despite this compromise in thought, the Jews in other ways stubbornly affirmed their own distinctness, and at Alexandria as elsewhere they proved a

---

[1]Contra Apion II 39. Cited by David Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul (New York: Harper [n.d.]), p. 6.

[2]Cited by Augustine in De Civitas Dei vi. 11.

[3]W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 402.

thorn in the side of governing officials, as well as being obnoxious to the Gentile inhabitants of the area. Time and again there were clashes between the Greeks and Jews at Alexandria, reaching a climax in the pogrom of the days of Caligula.

> . . . Claudius charges the Alexandrians to 'offer no outrage to them [i.e. the Jews] in the exercise of their traditional worship, but to permit them to observe their customs as in the time of Divus Augustus, which customs I also, after hearing both sides, have confirmed.' In one of the two edicts of Claudius, quoted by Josephus, it is said; 'I will, therefore, that the nation of the Jews be not deprived of their rights and privileges . . . but that those rights and privileges, which they formerly enjoyed, be preserved to them, and that they may continue in their own customs.' In the other edict these rights and privileges are accorded to all Jews throughout the Roman empire. That these rights and privileges did not include those of citizenship we have already seen, and the letter of Claudius bears this out. One of most important point for the Jews resulted from this; their synagogues were not desecrated by statues of the emperor, which had been the initial cause of the trouble.[1]

As for the Jewish community at Rome,

> the first time that anything in the nature of a persecution of the Jews took place was in the reign of Tiberius. This was owing to the action of an imposter, a renegade Jew, who had been driven out of his own country for some crime, and had come to Rome posing as a teacher of wisdom; he, with the help of three other rogues, persuaded a noble lady, named Fulvia, a convert to Judaism, to make a gift of gold and purple to the Temple at Jerusalem; but having got hold of these gifts the four thieves kept them. When this came to the ears of Tiberius he ordered all Jews to be banished from Rome. According to Philo, the banishment was really due to Sejanus, a high Roman official; on his death, Tiberius ordered that all the Jews, where-soever residing, were to be permitted full enjoyment of religious freedom; though he does not say anything about allowing the Jews to return to Rome, he evidently intended that this should be so, as, not very long after, a Jewish community is implicitly stated to have been in Rome again; for Claudius, at the beginning of his reign, put forth an edict confirming all the rights and privileges

---

[1]Ibid., Vol. II, p. 408.

> of the Jews throughout the empire, 'and this grant I make', he says, 'not only for the sake of the petitioners, but as judging those Jews for whom I have been petitioned worthy of such a favour, on account of their fidelity and friendship to the Romans'. Later on in the reign of Claudius the Jews were again banished from Rome, according to Acts xviii. 2; this is also mentioned by Suetonius.[1]

That the trouble-makers at Alexandria and Rome were not entirely representative is indicated by the fact that in the East the great majority of the Jews of the Dispersion led quiet and law-abiding lives.[2] However, it was also in the area of Asia Minor that some of the Jews showed themselves different from those of other areas by their adoption of Graeco-Oriental cults.

> But things like this were aberrations and not typical of the Jews of the Dispersion in general; the great mass, wherever settled, loyally adhered to the ancestral religion; as Tarn says, apart from the cults just mentioned, 'anything Jews took from Hellenism was only outward form; few learned anything of its spirit. Whether a Jew adopted or rejected Greek forms he remained a Jew, a man whose ideals were not those of the Greek, even if expressed in the same word.'[3]

The synagogues which had sprung up during and after the Exile were everywhere the centers of Jewish instruction and worship. Every town of the Roman empire of any considerable size contained a synagogue. These were managed by "elders," and every sabbath day witnessed the gathering together of all faithful Jews for prayer and study of the Torah. Despite the hatred excited by their exclusiveness, the Jews made many proselytes from among the Gentiles, as witnessed to by non-Jewish writers. These they instructed in their Law and in their hope of a soon-coming Messiah who they believed would throw off the Roman yoke and give victory and rest to Israel.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 414.

[2] Ibid., p. 421.

[3] Ibid., p. 424.

It should be remembered that the Dispersion of the Jews greatly facilitated the diffusion of Christianity.

> The heralds of the Gospel were themselves Jews, and their mission, like their Lord's was not to overthrow the ancient faith but to proclaim its fulfilment. It was no small advantage that, wherever they went, they found an audience which could understand their message; and in every town which they visited, they repaired immediately to the Jewish synagogue, and there preached the glad tidings. The Gospel was indeed a message of universal grace, but the providence of God had prescribed the apostolic procedure--'both to the Jew, in the first instance, and to the Greek.'[1]

Paul himself belonged to the Dispersion, and his birthplace and early training prepared him for the task of persuading Romans and Greeks as well as his own countrymen.

Christianity

It is not without cause that some historians have seen in many phases of the Graeco-Roman world a providential preparation for the spread of the Christian gospel. The Pax Romana, the ease of travel, the universal use of a common language (Koiné Greek), the stress on individuality which caused men and women to become more concerned regarding their eternal destinies, the wide-spread dispersion of the Jews and their sacred Scriptures, the gradual unveiling of the fatal flaws of Classicism--all these, and other elements of life in the first century, paved the way for the acceptance of a gospel whose idealistic monotheism surpassed anything known before.

The New Testament enshrines for us a revelation of early Christian preaching. One of its most striking features is the elevation of virtues which were not popular in that age, virtues such as humility and

---

[1]David Smith, Life and Letters of St. Paul, p. 7.

meekness. These were strange and new to paganism. Nevertheless, the center of the new religion was not a set of ideals or a creed but a Person. Christianity was different from all preceding systems of belief in that it based salvation, not upon the observance of outward rituals or the performance of prescribed good works, but rather upon relationship to a Person. Faith in Jesus Christ was the "one thing needful." True, the faith if genuine would result in beneficient works, but the fruit was not to be confused with the root.

Also of great significance is the claim of Christianity to universality of application. The Jewish Rabbi of Galilee had called Himself "the Son of Man" rather than "the Son of Abraham" in order to stress that His mission was for all men, not merely for the Jews. He had spoken about the many who would come from the east and the west to accept His gospel (Mt. 8:11), while His own race would reject both Him and His teachings (Mt. 21:33-43). With great assurance He had foretold that the day would come when His gospel of the kingdom of God would be preached throughout all the world as a witness to all nations (Mt. 24:14). When a prostitute in repentance anointed His head with oil, the Rabbi had declared that the story of that occurrence would be told throughout the coming ages beyond the rise and fall of mighty empires (Mt. 26:13). He seemed ever assured that against the universal fellowship of believers He was establishing, the gates of death and the grave would never prevail (Mt. 16:18), despite schisms, apostasies, and persecutions (Mt. 13:24-30; 7:22, 23; 24:9-12).

The first disciples, however, did not have the same world vision. The early Church began at Jerusalem, and may have remained there, but for the Jewish persecution described in Acts which scattered the believers.[1] The book of Acts is a chronicle of some of the missionary

---

[1]Acts 8:1.

activity of Christ's followers, but it is also a record of the initial reluctance of Jewish Christians to share their new treasure with the Gentiles. Yet the introductory words in Acts of the Apostles assert that the risen Christ had given a program of world-wide evangelization. "Ye shall receive power . . . and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." [1] Acts 1:8. The remainder of this chronicle of Luke's describes the progress of the Gospel in the areas and in the order named in this verse. The record of apostolic preaching begins with a proclamation of Christ in the capital city of Judaism, and it closes with the Apostle to the Gentiles proclaiming the same faith in Rome, the capital of the world.

Early Christians had not only a common faith. In some instances they shared a common treasury. Most important of all, they shared a love for all men, even their persecutors. They were a new genre on earth. Undoubtedly there were failures and backslidings, but the dynamic influence of this ethic upon believing Jews and Gentiles was undeniable. The new faith did not appeal merely to the uneducated, and we find Paul boasting of converts even in the palace of the Caesars. Men reared in the wisdom of the Greeks found in Christianity a more sublime philosophy.

Second only to Christ Himself, stands the person of Paul. He it was who began the evangelization of the West after his own astonishing volte-face. From his glowing pen came discourses, intended to be read aloud in local churches, which along with the Old Testament Scriptures and other writings of the apostles, became the sacred books of the new faith.

How was this new religion viewed by the leaders of the Empire?

---

[1]Unless otherwise stated, all texts are cited from the King James Version of the Bible.

At the first, Roman officials considered Christianity as merely a Jewish sect; and consequently it attracted little special attention from the imperial government. Only when the Jews in city after city began to persecute the followers of "the way" was it manifested that Christianity was distinct from the older form of monotheism. Probably the first Roman persecution of the followers of Christ was that by Nero in 60 A.D.

It should be noticed that while some parallels between Christianity and classical thought have often been noticed, there were differences that are much more significant. Particularly is this true in the matters of the nature of man and of history. Humanistic classicism saw in man a creature of reason who by the proper exercise of his powers could create a Utopia. But Christianity viewed man as a fallen being whose character was perverted as a result of original sin.

> The doctrine of sin and grace marks, in its most acute form, the breach between Classicism and Christianity. It had been the considered judgement of Aristotle that 'virtue and vice are both alike in our own power'.[1]

For Christians "the classical ideal of perfectability through knowledge or enlightenment was wholly illusory."[2]

> For if there was any single thing to which Christian teaching pointed, it was to a recognition of the authority of the Master as the one avenue to truth. This authority was conceived as absolute and exclusive. As such, it involved consequences of the most far-reaching character, the full significance of which was certainly not apparent, at any rate during the ante-Nicene period. But this much, at least, was evident, that it meant a departure from what, as we have elsewhere tried to show, was the conventional classical approach to the problems of human life, that is, through 'nature and reason'. At the same time

---

[1]Cochrane, p. 451.

[2]Cochrane, p. 452.

it suggested a new ideal and a new method of thought to be achieved through 'dependence' on Christ.[1]

> To begin with, [Christianity] affirmed that the historical Christ was the 'only Son' of the Father and so, quite literally, the God to end gods. It thus underlay what was commonly regarded as 'Christian atheism'. For to accept this thesis was to reject as fraudulent the multifarious deities of secularism and, in particular, the claim to divinity put forward on behalf of the 'virtue' and 'fortune' of Caesar. At the same time it was to dissociate oneself from the hopes and fears embodied in theAugustan empire. It thus accounts for that sense of alienation which led the Christian to describe himself as a pilgrim or foreigner in imperial society, and for his absolute refusal to participate in many of its most significant activities. It also explains why he found himself denied the easy toleration which was normally accorded to 'unlicensed cults'.[2]

Similarly, the Christian view of time was different from that of the Roman or Greek. He did not believe in endless cycles, but instead he asserted that time was moving towards a definite objective which he called "the kingdom of God." Providence, not the gods of chance, was directing in the affairs of history. After all, had not the New Testament promised in over three hundred places that Christ would return in glory?

> Thus envisaged, human history emerges as indeed a 'conflict of opposites', but the elements of opposition are not what Classicism had supposed. For they constitute no reflection of contending physical forces, in the clash of which mankind plays a dubious and uncertain role as the 'subjective factor of an objective process'. Nor do they mark a revulsion of man from nature, the subject from its object, a conflict for the realization of material or ideal, i.e. merely human and subjective, goods which recede forever from the grasp. Properly understood, history is the record of a struggle, not for the realization of material or ideal values but for the materialization, embodiment, the registration in consciousness of real values, the values of truth, beauty, and goodness which are thus so to speak thrust upon it as the very condition of its life and being. In these terms and in these terms

---

[1] Ibid., p. 224.

[2] Ibid., p. 225.

> alone can the secular effort of the human spirit be explained and justified, for only thus does it become intelligible.[1]

Thus in Christianity we trace the emergence of concepts which in all future ages would significantly shape the thinking of mankind. It seems impossible to understand Western culture, or to follow the thread of mediaeval and modern history, without recognizing in this revolutionary religion of lowly origin the most potent of all forces which have influenced mankind.

Morals of Graeco-Roman Society

> In every age you will find the two sorts of men, those who are sure that they are the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time, and those who are convinced that we are going to the dogs. In every historical period two other historical periods exist, the primal Golden Age forever vanished, and the blessed Millennium towards which we tend.[2]

Our concept of the morals of a particular society will influence our evaluation of that society. However, as pointed out in the preceding quotation, it is well-nigh impossible to develop a truly impartial view of any age; and furthermore, it is absolutely impossible for any man's summary to please all reviewers.

Beyond all doubt the moral conditions of the early Roman Empire have been both grossly exaggerated in some cases and greatly understated in others. In Rome's worst days there were men and women reflecting probity and virtue. Innumerable families were bound together by chaste affections, and the histories of the time are not without examples of courage and altruism. As one reviews the writings of men like Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, and Marcus Aurelius, it is obvious

---

[1]Ibid., p. 513.

[2]Edward Kennard Rand, The Building of Eternal Rome (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943), p. 178.

that the philosophers reflected, in their discourses at least, tenets which approached the ethics of Christianity, and these could not have been without influence.

A hint of the two-fold aspect of Roman life is indicated in the following quotation.

> Roman luxury did go to extreme lengths sometimes, and Suetonius, as well as the satirists, loved to give elaborate accounts of it. It is he who tells us of the flamingos' tongues, mackerel livers, pheasant and peacock brains, and lampreys which Vitellius caused to be collected by his fleet for a banquet. But over against Vitellius can be set the moderate and abstemious Vespasian, who after all proved to be a truer Roman. The elder Pliny disliked all forms of excess, and tells us with a shake of the head that "Clodius the son of Aesop the tragedian, having been left by him very well off . . . used to give each of his guests a dissolved pearl to drink," a very unlikely piece of gossip. These, and Poppaea the Empress travelling with a herd of asses large enough to assure her of a daily milk bath, are the kind of stories which have led to the widespread opinion that the Romans were extreme hedonists.[1]

While Waddy thus protests against the overdrawing of the picture of Roman morals, he also says:

> The minds of the Empire Romans, as shown in their literature, were unimpressive. There was also a failure of spiritual power which was just as telling. The religion and morality of the Empire makes a sad study. There is not indeed so abrupt a deterioration to record as in the field of literature; for whereas Roman literature had a great age from which to decline, Roman religion in the later days of the Republic was already losing its integrity. But under the Empire we find a steady crumbling of nerve and will, which was a great factor in the Romans' inability to survive. Half-hearted remedies, from time to time applied, never looked like checking the decline.[2]
>
> . . . Rome's self appointed mission was to make the world decent and comfortable. Her citizens were unblushing materialists, and their concentration on mere tangible things was an overemphasis which cost them their survival.[3]

---

[1]Waddy, p. 174.

[2]Ibid., pp. 215-216.

[3]Ibid., p. 169.

Despite these words from Waddy, it is not true to assert that all Romans were materialistic. As shown elsewhere, many citizens cherished religious and philosophical ideals which led them to look beyond the things of sight and touch. Nevertheless, the above generalization from Waddy is substantially correct and is repeated by many historians of the age. This prevailing attitude inevitably led to what adherents to the Christian ethic would consider as demoralization.

> To see the world in its worst estate we turn to the age of the satirists and of Tacitus, when all the different streams of evil, coming from east, west, north, south, the vices of barbarism and the vices of civilization, remnants of ancient cults, and the latest refinements of luxury and impurity, met and mingled on the banks of the Tiber.[1]

Most races have always copied their gods, and the deities of the Pantheon had set examples somewhat less than lofty. Thus Plato could say about the stories in Homer: "They are likely to have a bad effect on those who hear them; for everybody will begin to excuse his own vices when he is convinced that similar wickednesses are always being perpetrated by the kindreds of the gods."[2]

> "Neither Purity nor Humanity nor Mercy has a seat at the Olympian board. Often had Zeus fallen a victim to Aphrodite. So in reprisal (Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite) he fills her with a passion for the comely mortal youth Anchises. In all these epics the avowal of concupiscence is made with absolute frankness, as by the suitors of Penelope, or as between Odysseus, Kirke, Kalypso."[3]

Next to the gods, the philosophers may be considered the most influential in the matter of ethics. In Rome, the philosophy of

---

[1]Jowett, Epistles of St. Paul, p. 75, cited by Fisher, Beginnings, p. 195.

[2]Fisher, Beginnings, p. 195.

[3]Ernest G. Sihler, cited by Wilbur Smith, Therefore Stand, p. 236.

Stoicism manifested ideals, but these did not reach the masses. Epicureanism was more successful. Said Montesquieu: "I believe that the doctrines of Epicurus--which were introduced into Rome towards the close of the republic--did much towards corrupting the mind and the heart of the Romans."[1]

An eye-witness of the age with superior perceptual and analytical ability wrote as follows concerning the morality of his day:

> Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles. Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator. . . . For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. Their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural, and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in their own persons the due penalty for their error.
>
> And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a base mind and to improper conduct. They were filled with all manner of wickedness, evil, covetousness, malice. Full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity, they are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless. Though they know God's decree that those who do such things deserve to die, they not only do them but approve those who practice them. Rom. 1:22-32 RSV.

Paul, of course, had his prejudices, but we find that Seneca paints a similar picture (De Ira ii.8). The Stoic philosopher, in a lengthy catalogue, specifies the forms of immorality rampant in his day. These include the same unnatural crimes to which the Apostle referred. It hardly seems sufficient to say that every age has its infamy and that our own society has its share. In contrast to the

---

[1]Baker's translation of Montesquieu, p. 197.

record of the Empire, history indicates that before the Punic Wars, Rome had housed a community marked by temperance and industry. It would seem indisputable that the heady wine of victory and luxury changed the national character.

> The extinction of the free civic life of Greece, the conquests of Macedon, the foundation of the world-wide empire of Rome, had wrought a momentous moral change. In the old city-state, religion, morals, and political duty were linked in a gracious unity and harmony. The citizen drew moral support and inspiration from ancestral laws and institutions clothed with almost divine authority. Even Plato does not break away from the old trammels, but requires the elders of his Utopia as a duty, after they have seen the vision of God, to descend again to the ordinary tasks of government. But when the corporate life which supplied such vivid interests and moral support was wrecked, the individual was thrown back upon himself. Morals were finally separated from politics.[1]

Some particulars will now be considered under general headings.

The Character and Position of Women

Constituting as they do half of the race, women in their character and status mirror the essential nature of their times.

According to the old Roman law, a woman, with all her property, by marrying came completely under the power of her husband or of his father, if the latter was alive. This form of marriage, however, disappeared under the Empire. With it there disappeared other aspects of marriage.

> The standard of marital fidelity was not lower than now, but it was confined to the woman. There is no trace of a demand for a similar standard for the man. The primitive view, in some ways reasonable enough, was held that the fidelity of the man is not necessary, because his infidelity does not bring bastards into the family. The extra-marital connections of the man,

---

[1]Dill, p. 291.

> whether casual or permanent, were regarded as natural. It is significant that a religious inscription from Asia Minor, which otherwise inculcates a morality with which any one may be satisfied, expressly permits connections with women who have already lost their chastity. Against such connections there was not the moral ostracism which, in spite of changing conditions, still constitutes a powerful deterrent, and slavery gave every facility for keeping women for the satisfaction of lust.
>
> The evil went deeper than merely prostitution for the poor, and mistresses for the rich. The dissolution of the legal forms of marriage, which was brought about by women's demand for economic independence, supported by their fathers and relations, obliterated the sharp distinction between the married and the unmarried state, which, in spite of everything, is maintained by modern peoples.[1]
>
> Some of the most distinguished Emperors, like Vespasian, Antonius Pius and Marcus Aurelius, lived in concubinage. In the lower grades of society the distinction between marriage and concubinage must have been negligible.[2]

These quotations come from an author who, by carefully warning us against condemning "unjustly the immorality of the Empire," lays claim to personal objectivity.[3]

Certain of the laws of Augustus bear witness in this regard. He endeavoured to promote marriages by legal bribes but with little success. Even when marriages took place, the parties preferred to remain almost or altogether childless. "If a tithe of what Juvenal and contemporary writers say on this matter is true, licentiousness pervaded all ranks of Roman society."[4]

---

[1]Martin P. Nilsson, Imperial Rome, trans. S. C. Richards (London: S. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1926), pp. 323-324.

[2]Ibid., p. 324.

[3]Ibid., p. 320.

[4]Fisher, Beginnings, p. 202.

In the Graeco-Roman world the practice of homosexuality was not provocative of gossip. Philosophers like Plato could refer to it quite casually.

> In Greece the passion for beautiful boys (paiderastia) was relieved, in some slight degree, of its grossness, by an infusion of aesthetic sentiment. This kind of love, springing in part from the adoration of beauty, assumed all the characteristics of a sentimental attachment between persons of different sexes. Assiduous devotion to the object beloved, rivalship, jealousy, despair--all the phenomena of courtship and love--were connected with this unnatural relation, and served to cloak, even to the eyes of philosophers, the shameless indecency that belonged to it. There is scarcely a writer of Greece who directly condemns it. One effect of it was to disincline men to marriage, as both Plato and Plutarch remarked; and so this disgusting vice contributed to the reduction of the population of Greece, as well as to the moral ruin of her people. Like most other Greek vices, this form of impurity took root and flourished in Rome. Statesmen, judges, generals, and emperors were guilty of it. At the end of the sixth century, A.U.C., Polybius states that many Romans paid as high as a talent ($1000) for a beautiful boy. Cicero speaks of a case in which the sons of Senators, and youth from the highest families, obtained from the judges an acquittal, which a bribe of money could not procure, by this species of prostitution. Slaves were more commonly the victims of this base affection. All pains were then taken to stunt their growth and preserve their fresh and effeminate appearance; and the same thing was done in the case of free persons. The fact that stories imputing the vice of which we are speaking to a man like Julius Caesar, were in circulation, and formed a matter for jesting, even if the stories were false, shows the measure of toleration that was granted to practices which in modern times, would render the perpetrator of them an outcast and an object of loathing.[1]

Thus this practice also prevented the institution of marriage from occupying in society the place which later Christians would assign it.

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 205-206

The evidence seems sufficient to demonstrate not only that woman did not occupy the sphere to which "Christian" society would assign her but also the failure in this regard spawned other significant moral problems for that age.

The Evaluation of Life

The Empire, through its Pax Romana and its policing of land and sea, did much to make life safer than hitherto. Nevertheless, the estimate placed upon the right to existence was not high. The Augustan age itself had been ushered in by considerable bloodletting; and if Plutarch's estimate of the million slain by Caesar in Gaul is only half exaggerated, we find a barbarism, though not a skill, which equals that of an atomic age. The cheapness of a slave's life will be considered in a later section. Here we shall refer only to infanticide, the gladatorial contests, and the practice of suicide. Regarding infanticide one has written:

> The right of parents to destroy the offspring which it was not thought expedient for them to bring up, was recognized in law and practice. Sometimes such children were left by the Greeks to perish by starvation in some desolate place; sometimes they were killed outright. The moral teachers of Greece did not rise above the popular feeling on this subject. Aristotle approves of the custom of exposing infants where it is desired to prevent an excess of population; and, if, in any state, this is forbidden, he recommends abortion as a substitute. Plato, in the Republic, holds that children of bad men, illegitimate children, and children of parents too far advanced in years, should be destroyed by exposure; the state is not to be burdened with them. Among the Romans there had been originally a law forbidding the destruction of infants; but this law became practically obsolete. [1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 207-208.

As for the gladatorial contests, it is almost impossible to picture the large scale on which these were conducted. Julius Caesar had as many as 320 pairs in conflict, but 10,000 joined in the combats of the games under Augustus. In addition to the games conducted under the authority of the government, there were others provided by private individuals. The massive Coliseum, which was erected towards the end of the first century, witnesses to the public appetite for these bloody contests. Most of the gladiators were prisoners of war, slaves, or criminals under sentence. Some wealthy individuals kept their own gangs of contestants, either exhibiting them themselves, or renting them out to others. In various places, gladatorial schools existed for the training of those dedicated to the arena. Such schools were run by a veritable corps of officials including physicians, surgeons, fencing masters etc. The training was rigid, including a measured diet and nightly confinement to cells. Pompeii's ruins revealed the skeletons of gladiators who, chained to their prison, were unable to escape the cascade of lava.

> Strains of instrumental music preceded and accompanied the contests, which were introduced by a procession of gladiators around the arena, when the greeting may have been addressed to the Emperor: "Ave, Caesar, Imperator, morituri te salutant!" When a combatant was struck down, the victor appealed to the assembly of spectators to decide the fate of his fallen antagonist. Menials touched the slain with hot irons to see that death was not simulated. They were dragged out to the dead-room, where those in whom life was not extinct were despatched. At intervals, servants appeared to spade up the ground, saturated with blood and to spread over it a new coating of sand. The diversions of the amphitheatre were far from being limited to conflicts between men, or between men and animals, or among animals themselves. By ingenious and elaborate machinery, a stage could be made to rise from beneath the ground, and then suddenly, with the men, and beasts and whatever else was upon it, to sink out of sight. At the appointed moment, a platform would fall to pieces, and the man, who was standing upon it,

> would drop into a cage of wild beasts, and be instantly torn to pieces before the eyes of all. The boys and girls would be pleased with the gilded apparel and bright crown of one who came forward in the arena, when they would see the flames burst forth from his dress, and behold him leaping and writhing in agony until death ended his torture.[1]

Spectacles involving bloodshed on a larger scale were also offered to the voracious Romans. Augustus, for example, caused an artificial lake to be made near the Tiber, and here a sea-fight involving three thousand was held. Years later, a great multitude witnessed from the shore of Lake Fucinus a sanguinary combat between the nineteen thousand soldiers of two fleets. The Emperor Claudius presided, with Agrippina at his side. We gain some impression of the morals of the day when we find that Ovid prescribed the seats of the amphitheatre as a fit place for a lover to further his suit during the intervals between the combats.[2]

Chester G. Starr suggests that "the attitude of an age toward suicide is often a touchstone by which its individualism may be measured."[3] In the Roman Empire the right of a man to kill himself was almost universally accepted.

> The treatment of suicide as a right first became evident when old group attitudes broke down in the Greek world from the fifth century onward. In Stoic theory suicide was even at times a duty--like the death of Cato--to display or preserve one's freedom. In the Empire Pliny the Elder termed suicide "the supreme boon god has bestowed on man among all the penalties of life," and it was often preceded by public debate as to one's justification. Only as a new concept of the individual's place in the world emerged did pagan (and Christian) thought begin to deny men this means of exit.[4]

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 215-216.

[2]Ibid., p. 218.

[3]Chester G. Starr, Civilization and the Caesars: The Intellectual Revolution in the Roman Empire (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), p. 271.

[4]Ibid., pp. 271-272.

Slavery

The institution of slavery is discussed in the introduction to the analysis of the Epistle to Philemon. Some things, however, should also be stated here.

Every Roman of even moderate means owned some slaves and numerous households had as many as 500. On the great estates up to twenty thousand might labour as field-hands. The conditions under which slaves existed in the Empire varied so broadly that it is difficult to make a brief summary concerning them. While in some instances household slaves were so well treated that their devotion to their masters was unquestionable, and they had considerable freedom, in other cases, they worked in chains. Examples of the latter are found in the many underground workhouses which existed in Italy, where large numbers of slaves in fetters toiled at the mills. As for old or sick slaves--these were commonly carried to an island in the Tiber and left to die of starvation.

Not until the time of Hadrian was there any limitation of a master's power for life and death over a slave, and the advent of humanitarian legislation in the age of this Emperor probably sprang from the increasing difficulty of augmenting the slave complement. Prior to Hadrian:

> The stern character of the Roman law appeared in the powers which it gave to the slaveholder. He was clothed with absolute authority; he could beat, maim, and kill his slave with impunity. The slave could own no property, he could contract no marriage; whatever connection he was allowed to form with a woman was dissolved at the command of his owner. Slaves, when they were allowed or forced to give testimony, were examined under the torture. If a master was murdered by a slave, the vengeance of the law was visited upon all the slaves of his household, who were crucified without mercy.[1]

---

[1]Fisher, Beginnings, p. 209.

> When we consider the almost irresistible tendency to demoralization among the slaves themselves, the temptations to perfidy, licentiousness, and almost every other vice to which they were exposed, and when we consider the baleful influence which fell, from the unlimited control of all these human beings, upon the masters, and the contamination of the young by their familiarity with slaves, from the beginning of life, we shall feel that the amount of evil resulting from Roman slavery is beyond calculation.[1]

These are some of the aspects of Roman society which the subsequent Western culture was to decry. The picture from the viewpoint of most moderns is heavily shaded, if not entirely black.

Reviewing this brief outline of life in the first century, we are compelled to admire the achievements of Greek culture and Roman energy.[2] It is apparent that the Empire possessed a greater degree of glory than any powers which preceded or followed it; but as in the case with other cultures, its glory was tarnished and proved superficial at last.

This was the challenging world into which Saul of Tarsus was born. As Paul the Apostle, he was destined to be the chief agent in transmitting to the West the main elements of a new and enduring culture.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 211.

[2]Education in the Graeco-Roman world is discussed in the chapter "The Age of the Second Sophistic." Similarly, other pertinent historical details are included throughout the analyses of the Pauline addresses.

CHAPTER II

THE ERA OF THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

> What need there of long speeches in the Senate when the best men are soon of one mind, or of endless harangues to the people when political questions are decided not by an ignorant multitude, but by one man of pre-eminent wisdom?
>
> Tacitus. "Dialogue Concerning Oratory."

Great thoughts, great achievements, and significant and artistic expression seem linked together. Each mountain peak in sociological development has been usually accompanied by a significantly high-level expression in the arts. The age of Pericles, the zenith of the Roman Republic, the eras of the Renaissance and the Reformation, the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries in imperial England, and the nineteenth century in the United States, witnessed a burgeoning of the arts which set lofty standards for succeeding years. Similarly we find a resultant povery of aesthetic expression in eras of social degeneration and decline. Probably the field of rhetoric offers more historical illustrations of the foregoing generalizations than can be found elsewhere.

The classical age in Greece gave birth to the principles of rhetoric which, because of inherent worth, have been constantly reasserted from that age to this. Following the death of Aristotle however, there came a change for the worse.

> Whereas in the better days of Greek achievements the virtue of moderation and balance had been distinguishing marks of creative effort, now the tendencies toward excess and affectation became apparent. This unhappy circumstance asserted itself in Hellenistic prose, and particularly in oratory. About 250 B.C., Hegesias of Magnesia became the leader of the "Asiatic" school of thought. In violation of Aristotelian and Isocratean standards, this school produced an artificial style which, in the words of Atkins, "depended for its effects on epigrams, strained metaphors, false antitheses, over-elaborate rhythms, and the like." This style, which Atkins claims was "a breakdown of earlier traditions, rather than a fusion of the Asiatic and Hellenic geniuses," exercised considerable influence throughout the third and second centuries B.C.[1]

Similarly, when the Roman Republic merged into the thinly guised dictatorship of Augustus, and democratic oratory was greatly lessened, there occurred the inevitable decline of classical rhetoric. Thonssen and Baird declare that "This decline was well under way by Quintilian's time. He tried to revive the spirit of Ciceronianism while protesting the false tastes that were taking hold of the age."[2]

This new era has been named "the second sophistic." By the time of Tacitus in 81 A.D., the trend towards "Asianism" had become pervasive; and hereafter it dominated education and public speaking practice for several centuries.

Before considering the nature and causes of the "second sophistic" it would be advantageous to summarise the ideals and precepts of classical rhetoric. Only against such a background can the characteristics and values of the sophistic trend be appraised.

It cannot be overemphasized that thus to consider the status of rhetoric in these centuries is simultaneously to measure the standards of the prevailing education in these times. In the words of Donald Lemen Clark:

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 96.

[2]Ibid., p. 98.

> . . . in the Greco-Roman schools education was almost exclusively education in rhetoric, which the ancients considered an adequate preparation for life for free men, whom custom debarred from handicrafts and all activities involving manual dexterity.[1]

Similarly Thonssen and Baird plainly state that "the entire educational plan centered about rhetoric."[2]

> In Rome, as in the Greek-speaking countries, there were three successive steps in instruction. Normally these correspond to the three types of school taught by three special teachers. At seven the child entered the primary school, which he quit at eleven or twelve for the school of the grammaticus. When he was of age to receive the toga virilis, about fifteen, he passed to the school of the rhetor. The advanced studies normally lasted till he was about twenty, although they might be prolonged.[3]

The work of the ancient Grammar school in theory was to give instruction in all of the seven liberal arts. Literature, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music constituted the learning field. In practice, however, emphasis upon the mathematical arts was left for special schools, and instead the trivium's language arts were kept to the fore. In his Epilog, Clark once more stresses the almost synonymous nature of rhetoric and ancient education.

> . . . I wish to recall and emphasize the habitual association of rhetoric in the best of ancient schools with all the liberal arts which went to make up encyclopedic learning (encyclios paideia) or cycle of instruction. The same teacher, whether in grammar school or school of rhetoric, who taught the arts of speaking and writing, also read great poems, histories, and public addresses of earlier ages with the boys. The Roman schools did not suffer

---

[1]Donald Lemen Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), pp. 64-65.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, p. 98.

[3]Clark, p. 60, citing Marrou's Histoire de l'education dans l'antiquité.

from departmentalization as ours do. Rhetoric was not something to be taught as a separate and isolated skill, but an organic art, at work "discovering all possible means to persuasion in any subject."[1]

What then were the principles that were stressed when classical rhetoric reigned in the ancient schools? Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian provide the answer. While Quintilian lived during the second sophistic he was essentially a classicist.

Cicero in his De Partitione Oratoria tapped rhetoric with a silver hammer so to speak, causing it to fall into three divisions. (1) vis oratoris i.e. the speaker's resources as a speaker; (2) oratio i.e. the speech itself; and (3) quaestioi.e. the speech situation, which involves both the nature of the subject and the audience. Let us consider each of these primary divisions.

The vis oratoris included five subdivisions. While these are implicit in Aristotle they are not formally set out. Before the days of Cicero, however, it became fashionable among rhetoricians to discuss: (1) Inventio: Discovery of speech materials; (2) Dispositio: Arranging of speech materials; (3) Elocutio: Or the clothing with language of the assembled materials; (4) Memoria: The fixing of the speech in memory; (5) Pronuntiatio: Or the delivery of the discourse.

As for oratio this also had been divided into parts. Many followed the suggested six parts named by the Ad Herennium. They were (1) Exordium: An initial approach designed to make the audience attentive and friendly. (2) Narratio: A statement of facts slanted in favor of the speaker. (3) Divisio or Partitio: A preview of the main points the speaker intends to elaborate. (4) Confirmatio: Affirmative proof. (5) Confutatio: Refutation or rebuttal. (6) Conclusio or Peroratio: Conclusion.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 263.

Turning to quaestio, or the speech-situation, we find that Cicero suggested that this could be one of two kinds. Either the speech situation involved a general discussion or it was concerned with particular persons or occasions. The latter, called causa or "case" covered the Aristotelian categories of forensic, epideictic and deliberative speaking.

We shall next consider these parts individually, but necessarily treat them with brevity.

Among the five resources of the speaker, Inventio was pre-eminent. The weight of matter transcends its dress in importance, and therefore as many of the pertinent facts as possible should be investigated. To help oneself in this matter required that the status of the case be determined. This was the vital hinge on which the main issues turned. Such questions as: whether a thing is, what it is, of what kind is it, are the most helpful. Does the matter depend upon a question of fact, of definition, or of quality?

The next step will be to decide how to apply his facts so as to persuade his audience. Aristotle had suggested that the primary modes of persuasion were three.

> The first kind reside in the character of the speaker; the second consist in producing a certain attitude in the hearer; the third appertain to the argument proper, in so far as it actually or seemingly demonstrates. . . . The character of the speaker is a cause of persuasion when the speech is so uttered as to make him worthy of belief; . . . . Secondly, persuasion is effected through the audience, when they are brought by the speech into a state of emotion; for we give very different decisions under the sway of pain or joy, and liking or hatred. . . . Thirdly, persuasion is effected by the arguments, when we demonstrate the truth, real or apparent, by such means as inhere in particular cases.[1]

---

[1]Aristotle, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. Lane Cooper (New York: Appleton-Century, Inc., 1932) 1:2.

The "places" or "topics" of argument gave more detailed assistance in devising arguments. This involved the asking of the questions of how, what, where, when, and why? Cicero listed as places of argument the following: definition, contrast, similarity, dissimilarity, consistency, inconsistency, conjunction, repugnancy, cause and effect, distribution as of genus and species, or of past and present time, or of magnitude (more, equal, or less).[1]

Regarding dispositio, this involved not only the familiar divisions of exordium, statement, proof and refutation, and peroration, but also the manner of marshalling the vital arguments. Most rhetoricians felt that the strongest arguments should appear first, with some outstanding ones reserved for the peroration, and the rest placed in the body of the speech. Cicero, however, particularly stresses that the method of arrangement should always be adapted to the purpose of the speech. For example, the sequence adopted for an epideictic speech might be chronological.

Elocutio at its best embraced the four virtues of correctness, clearness, embellishment, and appropriateness. The usual analysis of styles stressed the grand, the medium, and the plain, which adjectives explain themselves.

Memoria included both learning a speech by heart or the mastering of its substance in order to speak extemporaneously. Quintilian felt that the former was best if the speaker was blessed with both a good memory and ample time. Otherwise the second procedure must be followed.

Pronunciatio includes both the use of the voice and the use of gesture in delivery. Demosthenes is the classic example of the importance of this element. Cicero declared that delivery has "the sole

---

[1]Cicero, De Partitione Oratoria, ii.7.

and supreme power in oratory."[1]

> According to Quintilian's doctrine, voice and diction, like literary style, should be pure, clear, embellished, and appropriate. Speech must be pure and correct Latin with no trace of the foreign or provincial. Speech must be clear through careful enunciation and observance of proper pauses. It should be embellished and can be if the voice has pleasing quality and is well controlled. Beauty of speech will be aided by careful avoidance of such vices as monotony, straining, excessive rapidity or slowness, panting, spraying saliva, chanting, and singing. Voice and diction will be appropriate if they are adapted to the subject of the speech. And he gives shrewd advice on how to use the imagination in stimulating emotions the speaker does not feel. "In representing such feelings, the first requisite is to impress ourselves as much as possible, to conceive lively ideas of things, and to allow ourselves to be moved by them as if they were real; and then the voice, as an intermediate organ, will convey to the minds of the judges that impression which it receives from our own."[2]

Having briefly touched upon the speaker's resources, let us now consider the speech itself.

The most well-known summary of the traditional division of a speech is found in De Oratore:

> . . . I had been taught that before we speak on the point at issue, the minds of the audience should be conciliated; next, our case should be stated; then the point in controversy should be established; then our allegations should be confirmed and those advanced refuted; and that at the conclusion of our speech what is in our favour should be amplified and expanded, what favors the adversary should be weakened and demolished.[3]

Aristotle had pointed to the need for an appropriate Exordium when he asserted that "It is plain that introductions are addressed not

---

[1]Cicero, De Oratore trans. J. S. Watson (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855), iii.56.

[2]Clark, p. 111.

[3]Watson, trans. De Oratore, I. xxxi. 143.

to ideal hearers but to hearers as we find them."[1] Quintilian suggests that:

> . . . he who is going to speak should reflect what he has to say, before whom, at what time or place, under what circumstance, under what pre-possessions of the public; what opinion it is likely that the judge has formed previous to the commencement of the pleadings; and what the speaker has to desire or deprecate. Nature herself will lead him to understand what he ought to say first."[2]

The same authority summarises the nature of the statement by declaring that it is an exposition adapted to persuade of what has been done, or is supposed to have been done.[3] Obviously it is chiefly the forensic speech which requires a statement of facts. The usual school formula for narratio was that of Isocrates, that the statement of facts should be brief, clear, and plausible.

The following quotation lays down a consideration of primary importance regarding our next division, that of proof or confirmatio.

> When we consider proof in rhetoric, we must be careful to remember that rhetoric does not concern itself with scientifically demonstrated truths, about which there is no debate, but with such contingent and approximate truths as lead to differences of opinion. We do not argue or persuade in favor of the probability of a proposition in Euclid. We demonstrate. Hence the Latin use of confirmatio as the term for rhetorical proof is less misleading than our habitual use in English of the one word, proof, both for scientific demonstration and for persuasive argument used in support of the probability of one side of a debatable issue.[4]

---

[1]Cooper, trans. The Rhetoric of Aristotle, III. 14.

[2]Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, trans. J. S. Watson (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1903), IV.i.52.

[3]Ibid., IV.ii.31.

[4]Clark, pp. 117-118.

to ideal hearers but to hearers as we find them."[1] Quintilian suggests that:

> . . . he who is going to speak should reflect what he has to say, before whom, at what time or place, under what circumstance, under what pre-possessions of the public; what opinion it is likely that the judge has formed previous to the commencement of the pleadings; and what the speaker has to desire or deprecate. Nature herself will lead him to understand what he ought to say first."[2]

The same authority summarises the nature of the statement by declaring that it is an exposition adapted to persuade of what has been done, or is supposed to have been done.[3] Obviously it is chiefly the forensic speech which requires a statement of facts. The usual school formula for narratio was that of Isocrates, that the statement of facts should be brief, clear, and plausible.

The following quotation lays down a consideration of primary importance regarding our next division, that of proof or confirmatio.

> When we consider proof in rhetoric, we must be careful to remember that rhetoric does not concern itself with scientifically demonstrated truths, about which there is no debate, but with such contingent and approximate truths as lead to differences of opinion. We do not argue or persuade in favor of the probability of a proposition in Euclid. We demonstrate. Hence the Latin use of confirmatio as the term for rhetorical proof is less misleading than our habitual use in English of the one word, proof, both for scientific demonstration and for persuasive argument used in support of the probability of one side of a debatable issue.[4]

---

[1]Cooper, trans. The Rhetoric of Aristotle, III. 14.

[2]Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, trans. J. S. Watson (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1903), IV.i.52.

[3]Ibid., IV.ii.31.

[4]Clark, pp. 117-118.

The materials of proof used in the art of rhetoric fall into two categories, the enthymeme, with the maxim included in this category, and secondly, the example. An enthymeme can be an incomplete syllogism with the major or minor premise omitted. In the enthymeme of Aristotle's conception, however, the conclusion may be drawn from a premise based on general opinion, rather than one of universal application. Here the argument is based on probability.

It seems apparent that Quintilian did not believe that oratory should consist of mere logical chains. After discussing deductive reasoning, he adds:

> It seems to me that I have gone through the sacred ritual of those who deliver precepts on rhetoric. But one must exercise judgment in using the precepts. For though I do not think it unlawful to use syllogisms occasionally in a speech, yet I should by no means like it to consist wholly of syllogisms, or to be crowded with a mass of epicheiremata and enthymemes, for it would then resemble the dialogs and disputations of logicians, rather than oratorical pleadings. . . . For what true orator has ever spoken in such a way?[1]

Regarding the use of examples Cicero wrote:

> The greatest support of a probability is furnished by first an example, then the introduction of a parallel case (similitude); sometimes a fable, even if it be incredible, nevertheless influences people.[2]

Aristotle felt that examples were best used in the form of supplementary evidence after the stating of an enthymeme.

> If they follow the enthymemes, they have the effect of witnesses giving evidence, and this always tells. For the same reason, if you put your examples first you must give a large number of them; if you put them last, a single one is sufficient.[3]

---

[1]Institutes, V. xiv. 27, 32.

[2]De Oratore, XI. 40.

[3]Cooper, trans. The Rhetoric II. 20.

In their discussion of the peroration most of the ancients recommend similar principles. The thoughts of brevity and summarization predominate. Aristotle also suggests devices of conciliation, amplification, and appeals to the feelings.[1]

Finally we have in the speech situation the third major aspect of the rhetorical art as viewed by the classicists. Herein is included an investigation into the nature of the subject, the speaker's purposes and the method of adapting the speech to the specific audience addressed. Hermagoras is credited with distinguishing between the quaestio infinita, the thesis or general question, and the quaestio finita, question which is limited by certain definite specifications of time, place, and person. This latter is also called the cause or case.

In the Orator, Cicero gives this advice:

> Whenever he can, the orator will divert the controversy from particular persons and circumstances to universal abstract questions, for he can debate a genus on wider grounds than a species. Whatever is proved of the whole is of necessity proved of the part. A question thus transferred from specific persons and circumstances to a discussion of a universal genus is called a thesis.[2]

It should be remembered that in his younger years Cicero had asserted in De Inventione that the orator should be concerned only with the cause. In De Oratore, however, he points out that all controversies can be and should be related to the essence and nature of a general question.[3] Clark declares regarding this mature view of Cicero:

> Thus Cicero, in enlarging on the thesis as a legitimate literary form adapted to the discussion of many questions not related to the law courts or the senate, was enabled to find a place for a number of his own literary works, including all his

---

[1]Ibid., II. 18.

[2]De Oratore, XIV. 45-46.

[3]Ibid., II. xxxi. 133-134.

> discussions of the nature, value, and use of oratory and his essays on duty, politics, philosophy, friendship, old age, and the nature of the gods. By the very nature and variety of his own interests he was forced, almost as Isocrates was, to take a broad view of rhetoric or the philosophy of the word and to include a great deal that Aristotle's narrow view of rhetoric excluded.[1]

Aristotle had dealt only with the limited question or cause under the headings of the epideictic, the deliberative, and the judicial. Occasional oratory is concerned with praise or blame and is delivered from the standpoint of the present. Aristotle recognized that this epideictic speech often bordered on other types. He said "To praise a man is in one respect akin to urging a course of action."

That rhetoric which is called deliberative has also been referred to as political, advocating as it does some course of action relative to the future. According to Cicero the objective of deliberation is utility. This will be agreeable to the audience. The speaker will ask such questions as--Is the proposed course of action possible? Is it necessary? Is it expedient or profitable in a material way? Is it honorable?

> As a speech must be adapted, not alone to the truth, but also to the opinions held by the audience, we must first realize that the people are of two kinds, one uneducated and uncultivated who prefer utility to honor, and the other humane and cultivated who place honor above all things.[2]

The third kind of rhetoric has to do with the justice of actions which took place in the past. Forensic rhetoric belongs to the advocate, and its ideal theater is in the court of law. The matters of the status and of the fivefold division of the speech particularly apply to judicial oratory. Particular attention should be given by the forensic speaker to the study of motivation and of all laws, civic and natural.

---

[1]Clark, p. 132.

[2]De Oratore, I. 90.

We have briefly named most of the essentials of classical rhetoric. How influential were these? To what extent did they pervade learned society?

> Although these precepts of ancient rhetoric are clearly designed primarily to train boys and young men to win audiences by addressing them orally in public, we must recall that from the earliest time, these precepts also guided those who addressed the public in writing. The epistles of St. Paul and Seneca, whether read aloud to groups or passed from hand to hand in manuscript, derive their structure and style from the same precepts of rhetoric as do the speeches of Demosthenes or Cicero. So do the verse epistles of Horace and the political, moral, and philosophical essays (or "written speeches") of Isocrates and Cicero. Indeed all ancient literature, verse and prose, was ransacked by the professors of grammar and rhetoric to furnish models of rhetorical style for schoolboys; and the precepts of style elaborated by the rhetoricians guided all writers of Greek and Latin, who in their boyhood had received instruction in the schools of grammar and rhetoric.[1] (emphasis ours)

Having considered the nature of classical rhetoric, we would now enquire into the nature of the rhetoric of the age of the second sophistic. On page 76 the cause of the new rhetoric was intimated. This should first be expanded before analysing the constituents of popular oratory in this era.

Baldwin has well said that sophistic is ". . . the historic demonstration of what oratory becomes when it is removed from urgency of subject matter."[2] By so declaring, Baldwin would refer us to the age that succeeded Cicero's impeachment of Verres. Democracy faded and the voice of the people was no longer heard in deliberative affairs. Government became "top heavy," and the officials of the Emperors, under the guidance of their masters, made all the necessary decisions. Neither deliberative or forensic oratory could flourish as before, and

---

[1]Clark, pp. 142-143.

[2]Charles Sears Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 7.

thus the field of occasional oratory with its encomium, or panegyric, was the only field left available for public speakers. Here was an area of address which catered to personal triumphs and exhibitionism, and these soon came to the fore.

> Under the dictatorship of the principate freedom of discussion in the school and in the forum ceased. It was not safe to discuss live issues. The more remote from reality or fictitious a theme was, the safer it was. Rhetoric is a living force only under some form of democratic or republican government. It dies or is emasculated under tyrannies, absolutisms, or dictatorships.[1]

Clark also refers to Harry Caplan's study "The Decay of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century."[2] After quoting at length from those first century writers who discussed oratory's decline, Caplan says "We learn that some of these clearly realized that eloquence flourishes best on soil dedicated to free institutions."[3]

The new rhetorical practice came to control the theory of education; and thus seed was planted for an enduring harvest. Apart from Quintilian and Tacitus, there were to be few effective critics of sophistic for several centuries. Even Augustine's disparagement of it was only indirect, as he pointed to a better way.

Turning now to the nature of sophistic we are first impressed with the fact that the rhetoric of this age was an end in itself rather than a means. It was Asianism revived. Its purpose was to give effectiveness to the speaker, whereas the purpose of classical rhetoric was to give effectiveness to truth. While Invention had headed the list of the

---

[1]Clark, p. 216.

[2]Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond, pp. 295-325.

[3]Ibid.

former canons of rhetoric, and Style and Delivery had been placed in the opposite position, this was reversed by the sophistic tendency. The new custom placed Style and Delivery in the position of primacy and almost ignored Invention, except as it existed in ready-to-hand forms. As previously mentioned, it seemed as though the compulsion of great themes which demanded expression had ceased. Had Aristotle or Isocrates been able to behold the new trend, it would have seemed to them that the whole world was now but one vast play-house and that every speaker's platform had become a stage. Declamation was not now an exercise to aid one striving towards perfection, it was, instead, an opportunity for exhibitionism. Virtuosity was the only real virtue.

> Instead of training youth to lead in public policy and to secure justice for individuals, declamatio had become an end in itself, the rhetor's own kind of oratory. As an exhibition of skill it was his easiest means of winning pupils, and of holding them by letting them exhibit themselves. The inherent vice of artificiality, which Quintilian admits by implication, he nevertheless assigns entirely to perverted educational practise. He would recall declamatio from invention to actuality, and from display to exercise.[1]

This reference to declamation as Quintilian found it points out the direction of emphasis in his time.

> The young people of the day had to have their natural and national liking for the beauty of the spoken word satisfied. The declamation as a work of literary art had become an end in itself.[2]

The criticism of Petronius, written about the middle of the first century A.D. agrees with the picture depicted above when it declares that: ". . . the net result of all these high-flown themes and the empty thunder of their platitudes is that, when the pupils make their debut in the

---

[1]Charles Sears Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 71.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, p. 99, citing W. A. Edward's Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder, ppxviii-xix.

courts, they feel themselves translated into a foreign world."[1]

It would seem that the exercises departed further and further from reality and the more fantastic and unreal the themes, the better they suited the new declaimers. It is significant that Tacitus, a contemporary of Quintilian, declares the old-fashioned method of teaching to have been vastly superior to the methods used in the schools of declamation of his day.[2] Donald Lemen Clark of our own day contends that even the declamations under the Empire served good purposes when taught by "sensible and experienced teachers."[3] Clark adds however, that in this opinion he differs from Bossier, Bornecque, Summers, Caplan, and Baldwin. Probably, however, he misunderstands the latter, who were ridiculing declamation only as taught by sophists and not that kind of declamation approved by Quintilian and other classical writers.

Let us look more closely at the exercises which were introductory to declamation. The work of Hermogenes is probably the best known as regards the progymnasmata. He wrote in the second century and belonged to the university city of Tarsus.

> In Hermogenes there are in all twelve exercises which introduce the boys to the rudiments, at least, of all three kinds of rhetoric. Deliberative rhetoric is represented by fable, tale, chreia, proverb, thesis, legislation; judicial rhetoric by confirmation and refutation, and commonplace; epideictic rhetoric by encomium, impersonation, comparison, and description.[4]

---

[1]Ibid., citing Petronius: The Satyricon, p. 1.

[2]Tacitus, "A Dialogue on Oratory," 30-35, The Complete Works of Tacitus, trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb (New York: The Modern Library, 1942), pp. 758-764.

[3]Clark, p. 251.

[4]Ibid., p. 181.

> There are several very interesting things for the modern teacher to note in these ancient Greco-Roman elementary exercises in speaking and writing. For one thing, the earliest of them, those practiced while the boys were still studying in the grammar school, were closely related to the study of literature. The boys paraphrased and retold stories which they were reading. They were trained to utilize proverbs and sententious sayings from the poets as amplifying material in developing themes. They were trained to make similar use of episodes from history and from biography. . . .
>
> Another interesting thing to notice is the preoccupation with religion, morals, and right conduct. With the Greeks and Romans, Homer and other early poets took the place the Bible has with us. Consequently the teachers of grammar, with whom the boys read these poets, took on something of the function of the Sunday school teacher as well as those of the teacher of grammar, literature and composition. Of course pagan morals were taught. There was nothing about faith, hope and charity; but there was frank and thorough inculcation of the cardinal pagan virtues of fortitude, justice, prudence, and temperance.[1]

Yet another striking characteristic of the progymnasmata was the fact that they mainly dwelled upon the general rather than the particular.

Practice in declamation followed the completion of the elementary exercises. As a school exercise declamation fell into two divisions--the suasoria which used historical or quasi-historical settings, and had for its objective the persuasion of one individual or of a group towards or away from a course of action; and secondly, the controversia, which was related to the forensic oratory of the law courts. In this latter exercise fictitious legal cases were engaged in, with the student acting either for the prosecution or the defense. Controversia was held by the Romans to be the more important of the two kinds of declamation.

> The themes for Declamatio were similar and in some cases identical to those employed by Seneca. Typical ones were

---

[1]Clark, pp. 208-209.

> historical or semi-historical such as "Demosthenes swears that he did not take the bribe," and "Should the trophies erected by the Greeks be taken down?" Fictitious themes included "The man who fell in love with a statue" and "The Magician who wished to die because he was unable to kill another magician, an adulterer."[1]

It should be noted that the classical schools were in agreement with the use of both the elementary exercises and the practice of declamation. During the age of the second sophistic these were still the prominent methods of instruction; but they had changed in purpose as witnessed to by Quintilian, Tacitus, Petronius, and other writers.

> Quintilian conjectures that Demetrius Phalereus invented the declamation on fictitious subjects. Originally a school exercise, it soon became little more than a showpiece permitting display and exhibitionism.
>
> Quintilian approved of the declamation, as he understood it, but not as it was practiced about him. He admitted that the "practice has so degenerated through the fault of the teachers, that the license and ignorance of declaimers have been among the chief causes that have corrupted eloquence." So he recommended its use as an exercise having "a very close resemblance to reality," even though admitting that the current practice was out of gear with his intentions.[2]

This misuse of declamation illustrates best the most striking characteristic of the sophistic, which was virtuosity. The accompanying stress upon improvisation, memory and delivery reveals this same characteristic. A later quotation from Lucian of Samosata indicates the emphasis upon these elements by sophistic orators. Baldwin describes the customary methods of improvisation:

> The improvisation was mainly of style. It consisted of fluency of rehandling, of variations upon themes, and in patterns, so common as to constitute a stock-in-trade. It permitted the use over and over again not only of stock examples and illustrations,

---

[1]Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic, pp. 10-11.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, p. 98.

> but of successful phrases, modulated periods, even whole descriptions. It was the art of a technician, not of a composer.[1]

The same writer tells us that dilation, after virtuosity, was the next characteristic feature of the sophistic. Dilation depended upon the devices of ecphrasis, with both higher and lower levels of decorative description.

The third characteristic of the oratory of this age was that of pattern.

> For the composition of the whole speech sophistic generally had little care. That planned sequence, that leading on of the mind from point to point, which is the habit of great orators and the chief means of cogency, presupposes urgency toward a goal. Sophistic often had no goal. The audience need be won only to admiration, not to decision. . . . As if to mark the lack of individual planning for cogency, sophistic is commonly composed upon set patterns. No other body of oratory has so uniformly resigned itself to forms. . . . The encomium of a country was expected to deal with its situation, climate, products, its race, founders, government, its advancement in learning and literature, its festivals and its buildings, unless indeed the whole encomium were based on one of these topics.[2]

The elementary exercises referred to earlier also illustrate the typical habits of form or pattern in sophistic oratory.

The fourth and final characteristic of sophistic suggested by Baldwin is the elaboration of style. The devices employed for this include literary allusion and archaism, decorative imagery, balance, clausula, and vehemence.

It is in an essay of Lucian of Samosata (c. 180 A.D.) written to caricature contemporary speaking practices that we find a graphic, if overdrawn, picture of the sophistic trend. Contrast his counsel with the classical model which has been previously outlined. Regarding qualifications and rules he has the following to offer:

---

[1]Ibid., p. 15.

[2]Baldwin, pp. 20-21.

> Bring with you, then, as the principal thing, ignorance; secondly, recklessness, and thereto effrontery and shamelessness. Modesty, respectability, self-restraint, and blushes may be left at home, for they are useless and somewhat of a hindrance to the matter in hand. But you need also a very loud voice, a shameless singing delivery, and a gait like mine. . . . Let your clothing be gaily-coloured. . . . Have also many attendants, and always a book in hand.[1]
>
> . . . pay especial attention to outward appearance, and to the graceful set of your cloak. Then cull from some source or other fifteen, or anyhow not more than twenty, Attic words, drill yourself carefully in them, and have them ready at the tip of your tongue. . . . Whenever you speak, sprinkle in some of them as a relish. Never mind if the rest is inconsistent with them, unrelated, and discordant. Only let your purple stripe be handsome and bright, even if your cloak is but a blanket of the thickest sort. Hunt up obscure, unfamiliar words, rarely used by the ancients. . . . As for reading the classics, don't you do it--either that twaddling Isocrates or that uncouth Demosthenes or that tiresome Plato. No, read the speeches of the men who lived only a little before our own time, and these pieces that they call 'exercises,' in order to secure from them a supply of provisions which you can use up as occasion arises. . . .[2]

Concerning Invention the counsel of Lucian is to avoid effort by all means. Eschew hard themes and the classical writers. In the moral realm this avoidance of stern endeavour will lead to personal effrontery and a sordid private life, in short--the reverse of what classical writers would have urged as cultivating ethos. As for logos, Lucian warns against logical sequence or reasoned presentations. In their stead strained analogies and odd precedents should be employed. "If you are speaking of a case of assault or adultery at Athens, mention instances in India or Ecbatana."

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 104. Citing Lucian, The Loeb Classical Library, IV, 155.

[2]Ibid., pp. 104-105. Citing Lucian, ibid., 155-159.

Regarding Arrangement, Lucian urges:

> Take no pains at all that the first thing, just because it really is first, shall be said at the appropriate time, and second directly after it, and the third after that, but say first whatever occurs to you first. . . .[1]

This caricature emphasizes style and delivery as the chief ingredients in the presentation which will give fame to the speaker. The delivery should be such as to fascinate the audience, rendering the orator the cynosure of their attention constantly. To this end the sophistic speaker should frequently slap his thigh, parade the platform, and manifest all kinds of extreme bodily actions.

Baldwin summarises excellently when he says:

> It is the drum that marks sophistic. Few of the devices of style so carefully cultivated are sophistic in themselves. What is sophistic is the use of them all, as from a classified store, in excess and with insistent emphasis. The sophistic style cannot be escaped. It is always saying, Here is style.
>
> Such rhetoric is not worthless. Some of its technical skill is available for better ends. But as other arts, to survive and progress, must be more than technics, so especially the art of words cannot go far without being animated by power of conception. Technic is promotive and educative only as it gives free course to motive and vision. As a system of education, therefore, sophistic was hollow. This is the issue raised by Plato; and he is justified by history. Sophistic could use its many devices only to exhibit skill, not to guide either the state or the individual.[2]

Thus before us we have pictured a system of rhetoric that was shallow because it consisted of forms instead of spirit. Its primary motive of self-exaltation made sophistic unworthy, and only the new inspiration emanating from the emerging sect of "the Christians" would prove sufficiently powerful ultimately to bring regeneration to rhetoric.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 159.

[2] Baldwin, p. 50.

Later it will be shown that while in terms of time Paul belonged to the era of the second sophistic, his attitudes and practices were entirely different from what has been delineated in this chapter.

CHAPTER III

SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND INFLUENCE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL

Paul is a man whom it is impossible to ignore. Whether we conceive of him as a deluded fanatic or as a saint makes no difference, for every thoughtful man must confess that his own immediate environment is what it is in some respects because of Pauline influences. The civilization of the West would be entirely different had there been no apostle to the Gentiles.

Wrote Sir William Mitchell Ramsay; one of the most brilliant scholars of classical learning:

> Of all the men of the first century, incomparably the most influential was the Apostle Paul. No one man exercised anything like so much power as he did in molding the future of the Empire. . . . Had it not been for Paul--if one may guess at what might have been--no man would now remember Greek and Roman civilization.
>
> Barbarism proved too powerful for the Graeco-Roman civilization unaided by the new religious bond; and every channel through which that civilization was preserved, or interest in it maintained, either is now or has been in some essential part of its course Christian after the Pauline form.[1]

Adolphe Monod in his French lectures gave the following opinion:

> Should any one ask me to name the man who of all others has been the greatest benefactor of our race, I should say without

---

[1]William M. Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, pp. 53, 100, cited by Wilbur M. Smith, Therefore Stand (Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1945), pp. 246-247.

> hesitation the Apostle Paul. His name is the type of human activity the most endless, and at the same time the most useful, that history has cared to preserve.[1]

While not all will agree with Monod, it is impossible to dispute Stalker's statement: "We owe to him hundreds of ideas which were never uttered before."[2] Kuist's following declaration is also undeniably factual.

> It was the result of his extensive teaching-travels throughout the Roman world that a Jewish sect became a world religion. His work was so important that some have even called him the second founder of the Christian church. He united the Occident and the Orient by bringing to Europe a religion which originated in the Orient. In this one way he predetermined the history of Europe to the present day.[3]

One half of the most influential book in the world, the New Testament, owes its origin to Paul. He himself wrote a quarter of it, and his friend Luke wrote another quarter providing the only information about the apostle that we have outside of the Epistles. Nor does his influence on civilization stop with the New Testament. More books have been written about this man and his ideas than about any other character in history, Christ excepted. In yet another way the world's literature is indebted to him because he was the spark which kindled many later minds of genius who subsequently influenced Western culture. In the year 396 Augustine, with troubled mind and heart, was walking in a garden near Milan when he heard the voice of a child singing "Take, read!" Beside him was a copy of Paul's letter to the Romans. On opening this, Augustine's eye fell on a passage so appropriate to his present

---

[1]Adolphe Monod, Lucile ou La Lecture de la Bible, cited by Howard Tillman Kuist, The Pedagogy of St. Paul (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1925), p. 136.

[2]James Stalker, The Life of St. Paul (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.), p. 93.

[3]Kuist, p. 141.

condition and mood that his whole life was thereupon changed. There are millions today who believe that the new Augustine became an incalculable blessing to the whole Christian world.

In a monastery cell centuries later, a miner's son turned priest read the same letter of Paul's. According to the historian Lindsay: "It was this contact with the Unseen [through the Epistle of St. Paul] which fitted Luther for his task as the leader of men in an age which was longing for a revival of moral living inspired by a fresh religious impulse."[1]

John Wesley, the man who saved England from a bloody revolution similar to that in France, the founder of Methodism and author of over two hundred books, found his way to service as a result of insight gained into one of Paul's major concepts. Wesley wrote as follows concerning this experience.

> In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate, where one was reading Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation, and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."[2]

Even the field preaching of Methodism found its spur in the example of the ancient Apostle.[3]

In the field of oratory and rhetorical criticism the influence of this unique character has been no less marked. Every volume or set

---

[1]Thomas M. Lindsay, A History of the Reformation, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), Vol. I, p. 204.

[2]The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M., Nehemiah Curnoch (ed.) 8 vols. (London: The Epworth Press, 1938), Vol. I, pp. 475-476.

[3]Abram Lipsky, John Wesley--A Portrait (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1928), p. 286.

of volumes purporting to represent in some way the world's great orators lists an impressive number of speakers who as preachers, or as social reformers, have taken their cue from the Jew of Tarsus. To erase from the records of eloquence such names as Chrysostom, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Bernard, Wycliffe, Latimer, Knox, Luther, Calvin, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fenelon, Baxter, Wesley, Spurgeon, Beecher, Brooks, Talmadge, Fulton Sheen, and countless others would impoverish the history of oratory; but how much more would this be the case were the names of secular speakers like Wilberforce, Bright, and William Jennings Bryan also to vanish! Recent articles in speech journals testify that the Pauline values are still employed by many as measuring rods in certain areas of speech criticism. This brief allusion to Paul's influence upon rhetoric could be augmented by similar allusions to his influence in most fields of human endeavour.

By Chrysostom, Paul was called "The Heart of the World." A far more recent writer has asserted similarly.

> When he speaks to us, mysterious powers awaken in us. He quickens us, kindles us, arouses us to aspire and dream. We have to reckon with him as a world force. He is a potent factor in social evolution. He is one of the determining influences in our Western civilization. The prints of his fingers are on our institutions. His ethical ideals stand in the marketplace. His ideas are running in our blood. He has woven himself into the fiber of our consciences and conduct. We are influenced by him even when we are least conscious of him. . . . The whole world would to-day be different had Saul of Tarsus never lived.[1]

We turn now to a brief sketch of Paul's life. The discussion of those elements in his early years which particularly shaped his oratory is reserved for a separate chapter. For the story of this life

---

[1]C. E. Jefferson, The Character of Paul (New York: Macmillan, 1923), p. 375.

the only major sources available are the Epistles and the book of Acts, and the following reconstruction is based upon the information in these.

Tarsus of Cilicia, at the eastern boundary of the Mediterranean, was the birthplace of Saul the Jew. Probably he received his Gentile name of Paul simultaneously with his Hebrew patronymic. The occasion preceded the birth of Christ by about a year. In all likelihood, the Roman citizenship inherited from his father had its origin at the time of special services to the State by some of his ancestry. Judging from the accounts of historians of the day, not all the citizens of Tarsus had the same privilege. While this city was a rival of Athens and Alexandria as regards education, there is no evidence that Paul spent any significant period attending the university of the Gentiles.

> To his birth and early residence in Tarsus may be traced the urbanity which the apostle at no time laid aside, and of which he was frequently a perfect model, many insinuating turns which he gives to his epistles, and a more skilful use of the Greek tongue than a Jew born and educated in Palestine could well have attained.[1]

Paul's education came chiefly from Jewish sources. First, he was trained in the home for about six years; and then he began to attend the school of the local synagogue. During these years preceding his teens, Paul was instructed in the trade of tentmaker not because his parents were in poor circumstances but because it was Jewish custom that every boy should learn practical skills by which he could support himself if necessary.

At the commencement of his teens, the boy journeyed to Jerusalem literally to sit at the feet of the Rabbi Gamaliel (Acts 22:3). His instructor was later ranked among the seven greatest teachers of Israel.

---

[1]"Paul," Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, 1st ed. Vol. VII (eds.) John McClintock and James Strong (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1877), 10 Vols. and 2 supplementary vols.

While personally tolerant and candid and well acquainted with Greek literature, Gamaliel remained an ardent Pharisee. Thus Paul could claim that he had been "taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers" (Acts 22:3). Scripture and tradition were his lesson books augmented by the parabolic ritual of the temple. Possibly at this time began the moral struggles characteristic of any earnest Jew who found his natural mind and heart at enmity with the strict moral requirements of the Torah.

The New Testament makes its first mention of Paul when it notes that he was a witness of the martyrdom of Stephen. On that occasion he held the clothes of those who threw the stones, and the historian calls him a neanias--a young man, which probably means about the age of thirty to thirty-five (Acts 7:58).

His ardent, intolerant nature fitted him for an Inquisitor, and the next mention of him in Acts depicts him as persecuting the infant church with all vigour. "As for Saul, he made havock of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison." Acts 8:3. Thus he endeavoured to compensate for the moral inadequacy experienced by all who strove to comply with the multitudinous requirements of the Rabbis.

Expecting to find at Damascus numerous believers in ὁ ὁδος--"the way"--Saul with helpers and authority from the chief priests set off for that city. Then occurred the crisis of his experience resulting in the persecutor's becoming apostle. The favorite of the Sanhedrin henceforward was to be the chief object of Jewish hatred. In three places in Acts, Luke tells the story of the transformation, twice using the testimony of Paul as given before his captors. While men may differ in their interpretation of what actually happened on the Damascus road, one thing is certain. Paul himself believed he saw a vision of the risen Christ entrusting him with a commission of the Gospel to all

the world. If he was deluded in this, we must attribute to coincidence the strange conformity of his later history and achievements to the message he believed Christ gave him that day. It is hardly sufficient to say that Luke invented the story, for most fabricators would have been far more careful to make the three accounts apparently harmonious in every detail. It is the very carelessness of the chronicler in this regard that suggests the honesty of his narration. Certainly the phenomenon of the Epistles requires a cause which if not identical with that given in Acts, must be yet as miraculous.

Luke continues his story by saying that the blinded pharisee was led by the hand to the house of one of those whom he had planned to persecute. Upon his host's praying for him, the new convert found his sight restored and heard from Ananias the words: "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see the Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." (Acts 22:14).

> Every word in this address strikes some chord which we hear sounded again and again in Paul's Epistles. The new convert is not, as it is so common to say, converted from Judaism to Christianity--the God of the Jewish fathers chooses him. He is chosen to know God's will. That will is manifested in the Righteous One. Him Saul sees and hears, in order that he may be a witness of him to all men. The eternal will of the God of Abraham; that will revealed in a righteous Son of God; the testimony concerning him, a Gospel to mankind--these are the essentially Pauline principles which are declared in all the teaching of the apostle, and illustrated in all his actions.[1]

Paul was baptized, broke his three days' fast, and began to preach in the synagogues that the expected Messiah had arrived in the person of Jesus Christ. The greater part of the succeeding three years was spent in Arabia in a period of seclusion and study characteristic of the preparatory work of many Biblical figures.

---

[1]McClintock and Strong, Art. Paul.

His Damascus preaching was resumed after this period until "the Jews took counsel to kill him" (Acts 9:23). Learning of the plot to murder Paul, the local Christians supervised his escape over the city wall in a basket.

Arriving at Jerusalem, he found that the leading clergy were suspicious of him because of his prior reputation. Barnabas became his sponsor, relating the news from Damascus to his cautious fellow-labourers. Paul's preaching at the capital had an effect similar to that at Damascus and once more he fled. In his home city of Tarsus he proclaimed his message until Barnabas arrived, suggesting that together they should preach at Antioch, where a great number had been converted to the faith. In this group Gentiles predominated, and possibly at this time Paul began to consider future plans for proclaiming to these non-Jews the message his own countrymen were rejecting. After a little more than a year, Paul was "ordained" and sent forth with Barnabas on a Gentile mission with the blessing of the local church leaders, who believed that the Holy Spirit had decreed the planned advance. This was the first of the three missionary journeys of Paul which are described at length in the book of Acts.

On this occasion Cyprus was first visited, and here Sergius Paulus, the pro-consul was converted. Next they preached throughout Pisidia and Lycaonia. The cities of Antioch (not to be confused with the Antioch of Cilicia), Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe heard the earnest voices of the Jewish preachers. The record declares that in one city the people called Paul "Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker." While the earlier chapters of Acts spoke of "Barnabas and Paul," following the latter's ordination the order is reversed; and it is "Paul and Barnabas" henceforward. The usual pattern of events in each community consisted of either a riot or revival as the result of the new preaching.

Some scholars place next in Paul's history the Jerusalem council described in Acts 15. On this occasion it was decided once and for all that the requirements of the ceremonial law should not be laid upon Gentile converts. It was also agreed that while Peter should lead in the work among the Jews, Paul was to be the missionary to the Gentiles.

In his second tour the Apostle was accompanied by Silas, and Timothy joined him at Lystra. The converts in Eastern Asia Minor were revisited and churches established in Galatia and Phrygia. At Troas he received the famous Macedonian call and crossed to Europe. In Philippi a church was planted which remained the most loyal of all to Paul throughout the remainder of his career and to which he wrote the New Testament letter bearing their name. Following his imprisonment at Philippi he preached at Thessalonica, which was the chief city of Macedonia. Renewed persecution drove him to Athens, where he debated with Stoics and Epicureans and gave the address from Mars Hill. The following eighteen months were spent at Corinth, the rich, prosperous city which had arisen from its ruins. Probably it was from there that he wrote his two epistles to the Church at Thessalonica. A short stay at Ephesus climaxed this second tour; and he returned to Antioch his headquarters, via Caesarea and Jerusalem. Not for long, however, did he interrupt his travels. Taking the land route for the commencement of his third tour, he crossed Asia Minor to Ephesus, where he laboured for nearly two years. The letter to the Galatians had its birth here, and likewise the first epistle to the Corinthians. From Ephesus he went to Philippi and a subsequent three months stay in Greece during which he sent his famous letter to the Romans. His desire was to be at Jerusalem for the feast of Pentecost. Thus he decided to sail by Ephesus and bid farewell to the elders of that church during a brief stop at Miletus.

The Jerusalem visit was the beginning of the end for Paul. In his anxiety to be "all things to all men" so far as loyalty to Christ permitted, he ventured into the temple to demonstrate that he had no prejudices against the laws of Moses. A mob was roused against him, and he would have died on the spot had not Roman soldiers intervened. For two years he was held at Caesarea and then embarked for Rome as the result of his appeal to Caesar.

In Acts 27 we have the most famous account of any ancient shipwreck, as Luke describes Paul's being cast ashore on the island of Malta. On arrival in Italy he was cheered by an escort of enthusiastic Christians en route to Rome. His ambition to preach at the heart of the Empire was on the eve of its fulfilment but in a different fashion from that he had conceived. While under the surveillance of the Praetorian guard, he was allowed to teach in his own hired rooms all who wished to visit him. Even some from among "Caesar's household" became his converts.

During this period he dictated his messages to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and the Philippians, and to Philemon. The Pastoral Epistles--I and II Timothy and Titus--suggest that Paul was released at his first trial. Most scholars believe that he visited Macedonia again and Asia Minor twice. It is even possible that he journeyed as far as Spain. We are not told the circumstances leading to his second imprisonment; but about the year 67 A.D. he was martyred, probably by beheading at Nero's command.

Shortly after his death the temples of Rome and of Jerusalem, the Capitoline Jupiter, and the sanctuary on Mount Zion, were destroyed; "as if to signalize the death of the hero of the faith, who had smitten with a fatal blow the stupendous fabrics of Gentile and Jewish worship."[1]

---

[1]George P. Fisher, History of the Christian Church (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1887), p. 30.

No man living in that age stands on so high a plane, intellectually and morally, as the Apostle Paul. No fact in the history of that period is more sublime than the unfaltering constancy of his faith.[1]

[1]Ibid., p. 29.

CHAPTER IV

ELEMENTS WHICH SHAPED THE ORATORY OF PAUL

Inasmuch as all oratory reflects to some degree the orator, the question regarding the elements which shaped the oratory of Paul is actually an enquiry into the formative influences responsible for the character, temperament, and peculiar genius of Paul.

These influences mainly consist of his natural inheritance, the home training and city environment of Tarsus, the continued education in the Torah and Jewish traditions at Jerusalem, the practical instruction of learning a trade, and most of all the climactic experience which he claimed overtook him on the Damascus road. Every phase of Paul's thinking and style can be traced to one or more of these influences.

First of all he was born "a Hebrew of the Hebrews." To read Edersheim's characterization of this "peculiar people" is to understand at least in part what this involved.

> Excitable, impulsive, quick, sharp-witted, imaginative; fond of parable, pithy sayings, acute distinctions or pungent wit; reverent towards God and man, respectful in the presence of age, enthusiastic of learning and of superior mental endowments, most delicately sensitive in regard to the feelings of others; zealous, with intensely warm Eastern natures, ready to have each prejudice aroused, hasty and violent in passion but quickly assuaged.[1]

Such was Paul by inheritance. He was born into a family of the Pharisees about a year or two before the birth of Christ. The Pharisees "despite too frequent intolerance and traditionalism, comprehended most that

---

[1]Edersheim, Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ, p. 89, quoted by Kuist, p. 12.

was godly and all that was patriotic in the later Judaism."[1] Probably it was at his birth that the names of Saul and Paul were given him. Saul, the Hebrew name, means "asked for," and possibly the parents viewed their only son as an answer to prayer. The New Testament tells us he had one sister but no other children are mentioned. "Paul" is the name by which he would be known among the Gentiles. "Paulus" is Roman rather than Greek and signifies "little." Possibly from infancy he was small in physical form, but centuries later one Chrysostom was to describe him by saying "Three cubits in stature, he touched the sky." Apparently he did not possess the kind of physique advantageous to a public figure, but this very drawback may have acted as a spur to his early ambitions. How Paul's father came by Roman citizenship we are not told, but the extension of the franchise was not uncommon to some in Rome's conquered lands. This part of his inheritance opened the doors of the whole Roman world to Paul.

The significance of Paul's early years cannot be overestimated. The Jews believed that the home stood supreme as an educational institution. This is apparent in Paul's later writings. (Cf Eph 5:22-33; 6:1-4; Col 3:18-20)

> The modern Rousseauian theory that parents must win their authority over their offspring by the superiority of parental wisdom and goodness found no place in Hebrew thought. On the contrary, parents ruled by divine right.[2]

According to the Talmud the primary duties of the father were to circumcise his son, teach him the Torah, and have him instructed in a trade. The child's curiosity was constantly aroused by some phase of Jewish ritual, and his questions were answered by narratives from

---

[1]David Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul (New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), p. 21.

[2]F. H. Smith, Education in Ancient Israel from Earliest Times to 70 A.D., cited by Kuist, p. 31.

sacred history. Object lessons were found in the pathway of everyday duties, and at set seasons of the year such as Passover and Pentecost the symbolic instruction was multiplied.

> Pervaded by a continuous sense of the reality, holiness, purity, and graciousness of Jehovah in the manner and atmosphere of his home life, the child's religious consciousness was awakened, stimulated, and nurtured.[1]

From the dawn of understanding Jewish children were taught to memorize the sacred precepts until these were engraved upon the heart. This immersion in the Scriptures continued at the elementary school attached to the local synagogue where the child was sent at the age of seven and later still when he sat at the feet of some learned Rabbi if, like Paul, he was sent to the holy city.

This concentration upon the Old Testament is one of the most evident influences upon Paul traceable in his oratory and writings. In his epistles alone he quotes from the Old Testament over ninety-five times (excluding quotations in Hebrews) and makes references to these same writings on about half as many occasions. Such results were inevitable when we recall that his race believed that one who could not read was no true Jew and consequently the Old Testament was used as the spelling book in hundreds of synagogues and schools throughout the whole Roman empire.

We need to recall the pedagogical and rhetorical elements of the Hebrew Scriptures if we are rightly to trace their influence on the Apostle to the Gentiles. First there is Moses, who according to Laurie in his Pre-Christian Education[2] was the greatest of schoolmasters. Paul quotes from, or refers to, Moses twenty-five times. He was aware that Moses had been an orator par excellence. How often he had read

---

[1]Kuist, p. 33.

[2]S. S. Laurie, Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education, p. 66, cited by Kuist, p. 24.

the seven sermons from the mount given by Moses and recorded in Deuteronomy! He would have observed that this first of Israel's preachers had a personality which actually radiated the truth of his messages (Ex 34:27-35). Furthermore Moses had taught by the power of example (Num 12:3, 7; Heb 3:2, 5) as well as by word, symbol, command, and act (Ex 19:1-6; Deut 1:1, 9-17; Ex 7:8-13; Ex 14:10-31; Ex 15:1-18).

Also in the Old Testament he found some that taught by an appeal to the feelings primarily. These were the Priests with their significant linen robes, grave demeanour, and colourful symbolic ceremonies.

From the Psalmists with their sublimity and tenderness Paul "was prepared to teach the 'universal language of religious emotion.'"[1]

Most of all the Prophets contributed to his ideal.

> They were the masters of the art of persuasive speech. They faced the task of opening blind eyes and deaf ears to the perception of truth. Theirs was the mission to impel weak wills to right living. They rubbed shoulders with their fellows and knew and understood them. They knew how to teach. They won attention not only because their enthusiasm was contagious but because they called for and expected it. They introduced their lessons with: "Ho!" "Come near!" "Hear ye!" "Behold!" "Listen!" "Awake, awake!" "Arise, shine!" (Isa 29:1;55:1; 34:1; 1:10; 44:1; 46:3; 48:1, 12; Jer 2:4; Isa 24:1; 32:1; 42:1; 59:1, etc; 49:1; 51:9, 17, etc. 52:1; 60:1). They utilized likely occasions to impart truth. (Jer 7:1-7; 20:1-6; 26:1-7.) They found points of contact in their immediate circumstances. (Eze 24:15-18). They chose concrete illustrations from life all about them, from nature (Jer 8:7; 12:8-10; 13:23; 14:2-6) and from history (Micah 7:18-20; Hosea 11:1-4). They used pointed questions to probe sluggish minds (Isa 40:6, 12, 27, 28; 53:1 etc.). They proceeded from the known to the unknown (Ia 28:23-29). They used proverbs (Eze 18:1-4ff; Jer 31:29), parables (Isa 5:1-7; 27:2-6; Eze 17:1-24; 24:1-5), figures of speech (Ia 48:18, 19; Jer 2:13, 17:1 etc), to accommodate their truth to the understanding of their hearers. They employed visions (Jer 1:11, 12, 13ff; 24:1-10; Eze 1, 2, 37:1-14

---

[1]Kuist, p. 26.

> etc.), symbols (Eze 4:1-4; 19:1-9 etc.), object lessons (Jer 13: 12-14; 18:1-4ff; 36:1-8ff; Ezek 4:4ff., 9ff; 5:1ff., 21:1-7), and dramatic actions (Jer 13:1-7ff., 16:1-4, etc.) to stir the imagination and touch the conscience. They cast their messages into acrostics (Lamentations 1-5) and poetic form, choosing the meter best adapted to their message (Cf Swift, Education in Ancient Israel, p. 36). They atmosphered all their contacts with tremendous earnestness (of which 1 Kings 18 is typical). They met adverse situations with a courage that defied their antagonists (Jer 38:1-13; 21:9, etc.). They spoke not because they had to say something, but because they had something to say (As C. Alphonso Smith, What Can Literature Do for Me? New York, 1918, p. 18). They were the spokesmen of Jehovah (Isa 6:6ff.; Jer 1:17 ff; Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6, etc). They clothed their words with a ring of authority that made their message glow with conviction (Isa 44:6, 21; 45:1, 14; 48:17). [1]

This lengthy quotation is given because it best summarizes not only the characteristics of the preaching of the prophets but also the characteristics of Paul's oratory. Deissmann rightly placed Paul among the prophets.[2] Like them he sprang from among the common people and was familiar with daily toil. Like them he faced the task of opening the blind eyes and deaf ears to the perception of truth. He had a similar enthusiasm and conviction of divine call, and a compelling earnestness. It is beyond question that Paul's study of the prophets was one of the chief elements which shaped his own messages.

While at Jerusalem studying under the Rabbi Gamaliel, Paul would have been subjected not only to the Old Testament but to the vast accumulation of Jewish lore and wisdom which later became known as the Talmud.

---

[1]Kuist, pp. 26-27.

[2]St. Paul, p. 6.

> The Talmud, that great written museum containing untold treasures of a civilized world of six bygone centuries, that wonderful and universal encyclopaedia, which with the Mishna and the Midrash which follow in its train, presents twice as many volumes as the Encyclopaedia Brittanica . . . Not the work of a few individuals, but a work of great scientific importance. It is a work by the whole Jewish nation, as well as by others who indirectly contributed to that remarkable gazette of the world. . . .[1]

Every Gentile reader of the Talmud knows it to be a monument of human folly as well as a storehouse of truth. Apparently Paul sifted the one from the other for we do not find him citing from the Jewish traditions after the manner of the Rabbis of his day. Nevertheless there are areas in Paul's arguments which reflect the rabbinical mode of discussion.

So far the influences we have been considering have been those emanating from Judaism. Also to be considered is the Graeco-Roman culture of Tarsus upon Paul. It should be remembered that this culture had made some impingement even upon Judaism. For example while Paul was familiar with the Scriptures in the Hebrew language, he was more conversant with the Greek translation known as the Septuagint. The language of his infancy was Koiné Greek, although he was also competent in handling the vernacular Aramaic of Palestine. Paul was thus the native of a city mainly Greek in population and incorporated with Rome.

Tarsus is called by Paul "no mean city." It was the western capital of the united province of Syria-Cilicia, and in Paul's day it was at the peak of its fame and prosperity. Situated only three-quarters of a mile from the sea, it enjoyed lucrative commerce through her port at the mouth of the river on which the main city was situated.

---

[1]Imber, U. S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1894-95, Vol. II, p. 1808, cited by Kuist, p. 29.

According to Dr. David Smith "she was at that period the world's principal seat of learning." He quotes the geographer Strabo to this effect, as does almost every commentator on the early life of Paul. Wrote Strabo--

> So deeply are the people there imbued with zeal for philosophy that they have surpassed Athens and Alexandria and every other place that can be mentioned.

And Smith adds--

> And she possessed this proud distinction which Alexandria alone shared--that her savants were all natives. Students flocked to her schools from other lands, but she had no need of alien teachers. On the contrary, she had no room for the multitude of her learned sons, and she sent them abroad to enlighten the world. 'Rome especially can learn the multitude of the city's savants; for she is full of Tarsians and Alexandrians.'[1]

We naturally ask--did Paul ever attend the university of Tarsus? Did he imbibe through Gentile teachers hellenistic thought? This has long been debated, but the weight of the evidence today in scholarly circles suggests that Paul's education was strictly Jewish with no formal training of length from Gentiles. Admittedly his Rabbi Gamaliel was almost unique in Jewish circles for his study of the writings of the Greeks, and admittedly Paul on at least three occasions quotes from these sources. Nevertheless Paul's knowledge of the pagan world and thought came primarily from his mixing with men rather than with books, and the fragments he quotes from heathen authors are those which would have been known to any man in the street regardless of whether he could read.

Farrar says on this point--

> But who that has read St. Paul can believe that he has ever studied Homer, or Aeschylus, or Sophocles? If he had done so, would there--in a writer who often "thinks in quotations"--

---

[1]David Smith, Life and Letters of St. Paul (New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), p. 18.

> have been no touch or trace of any reminiscence of, or allusion to, epic or tragic poetry in epistles written at Athens and at Corinth and besides the very tumuli of Ajax and Achilles? . . . Nothing can be more clear than that he had never been subjected to a classic training. . . . It is doubtful whether the incomparable energy and individuality of his style and of his reasoning would not have been merely enfeebled and conventionalised if he had gone through any prolonged course of the only training which the Sophists of Tarsus could have given him.[1]

What then was the main influence of Tarsus upon Paul? Most modern biographers of Paul who can claim to be scholarly reject the idea that he gained either literary tastes or the Stoical philosophy from the instructors of Tarsus. What then remains?

Firstly, it was his citizenship of Tarsus which gave the future apostle to the Gentiles his cosmopolitan outlook. He learned to mix with men of all classes and of all nations, and his sympathies were to extend to all. It was peculiarly fitting that this man who was to communicate the gospel to Europe was not born in Palestine, or reared at Jerusalem.

But there was something else Paul learned from Tarsus. This city had been the fitting burial place of Julian the apostate. It was counted by its contemporaries among the tria kappa kahista, i.e. the "three wicked K's" of the day, and these were Kappadokia, Kilikia, and Krete. (Tarsus being a main metropolis of Cappadocia). Culture had not brought moral renovation to Tarsus. Instead it was the center of orgiastic idolatry. Impurity, gluttony, and brutality characterized the syncretistic worship of the city. Paul would have seen the statue of Sardanapalus, traditional founder of Tarsus. This figure is represented as cynically snapping his fingers while uttering the sentiment inscribed upon its pedestal--"Eat, drink, enjoy thyself; the rest is

---

[1]Frederic W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul (London: Cassell and Company, Limited, 1908), pp. 22-23. Henceforward referred to as St. Paul.

nothing." The earnest Jewish lad must early have been impressed that the highest culture, the most thorough education, without a knowledge of God, could not banish the darkness of the soul. He would realise, from the best that paganism had to offer, man's helplessness when bereft of divine revelation. Later these convictions were to find expression in burning words in such passages as Romans 1:22-32.

> Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles. . . .
>
> For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. Their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural, and the men likewise. . . .
>
> They were filled with all manner of wickedness, evil, covetousness, malice. Full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity, they are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless. RSV

One cannot help enquiring--What would the future history of the world have been if this Jewish lad had conformed to the pattern of the Tarsian majority?

Paul probably laboured at his trade of tent-making in Tarsus following his years of rabbinical training in Jerusalem. In all liklihood he was there during the years of Christ's ministry in Palestine. Thus compelled to join the practical world of men and things it was impossible for the Jewish scholar to become a bookish recluse. At his trade he learned many things that books can never teach. The sober commonsense so apparent in his counsel to troubled churches owed its origin in part at least to his intercourse with the Gentiles in the marketplaces of Tarsus. Here the foundation was laid for him to become "all things to all men." This too had its influence on the oratory of Paul. The speaker in this instance is one who is also "mighty in deeds" and the energy of his labours enters into every word he utters.

The most significant of all factors influencing Paul has yet to be considered. It is the Damascus road experience. Men will differ in their views as to exactly what happened on that occasion. One thing however is certain. The persecutor stopped in his tracks and became a zealous protagonist of the cause he had so vehemently opposed. Something happened. A result so tremendous calls for a cause of similar magnitude. The theory of an epileptic fit is entirely incongruous with the picture of the hardy missionary described in Acts. An optical illusion would have to be powerful indeed to give its witness the sensation of blindness for several days and to revolutionise his thinking. The majority of mankind would require an event extraordinary to say the least before they turned their back on their present mode of living and on their friends to become the hated quarry of an enraged nation. It is a historical fact that some scholars of unimpeachable character and enviable scholarship have changed their minds in this matter of Paul's conversion. Sir William Mitchell Ramsay and Adolf Deissmann, an English and a German scholar respectively, forsook their arm-chairs where they had weaved sceptical theories and travelled to Asia Minor and Palestine to explore the lands of Paul. The results of years of exploration placed these scholars beyond their original skepticism and in the ranks of orthodoxy. Both have written learned volumes upon Paul. Apparently there are still some men of education prepared to accept Paul's word concerning what happened to him on the Damascus road.

Whatever happened; the result is clear. Paul believed he had been confronted by the risen Christ and commissioned as a world herald of the faith he had persecuted. His best friend, a physician, records the story in three places in his narrative. Here we read what Paul held to be his divine commission, delivered by One whom his countrymen had murdered.

Says Luke's record, quoting Paul's description of the words of the risen Christ--

> I am Jesus whom you are persecuting. But rise and stand upon your feet; for I have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you to serve and bear witness to the things in which you have seen me and to those in which I will appear to you, delivering you from the people and from the Gentiles--to whom I send you to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me. Acts 26:15-18 RSV

Whether we agree or disagree with Paul's version of what happened to him is not relevant at this juncture. That which is significant is that the words he quotes do admirably sum up his own subsequent career. Note certain key words--to serve and bear witness, delivering you from the people (Jews) and from the Gentiles, that they may turn, etc. These words summarise the remainder of the life of Paul. No man served as wholeheartedly as he. Contrasting his ministry with that of pseudo-apostles he could say in his second address to the Corinthians--

> Are they servants of Christ? I am a better one . . . with far greater labors, far more imprisonments, with countless beatings, and often near death. Five times I have received at the hands of the Jews the forty lashes less one. Three times I have been beaten with rods; once I was stoned. Three times I have been shipwrecked; a night and a day I have been adrift at sea; on frequent journeys, in dangers from rivers, danger from robbers, danger from my own people, danger from Gentiles, danger in the city, danger in the wilderness, danger at sea, danger from false brethren; in toil and hardship, through many a sleepless night, in hunger and thirst, often without food, in cold and exposure. And, apart from other things, there is the daily pressure upon me of my anxiety for all the churches. 2 Cor. 11:23-29 RSV

Besides being a superb example of <u>ethos,</u> these words picture how exactly his life after the Damascus road experience had corresponded

with the forecast there given to him. Indeed he had served and borne witness, certainly he had stood in constant need of deliverance from Jewish and Gentile persecution, and just as surely many of his listeners had turned from their former way of life to the way of Christianity.

Thus we are compelled to recognise in the crisis of Paul's life recorded in Acts the most important of all the factors which influenced the oratory of Paul. Whatever that experience was, it left the Apostle with definitive values, with immovable convictions which henceforward shone through every sentence he uttered. It has been said that there are no subjunctive moods with Paul. This is true and the reason may be attributed to the influence we have just considered. Every major concept of the Apostle which we will trace in his addresses is the development of the seed that was planted at the turning point of his career. Hereafter he is a man "in Christ" and this he recognizes to be the answer to the soul struggles after righteousness he had known as a Pharisee. Christ is risen indeed, Paul asserts or "we are of all men most miserable." And because Christ is risen He will come again according to His promise to redeem from this life or the grave all who have become his heirs by simple confiding trust. Therefore he (Paul) is "a debtor unto all men" and woe to him if he preach not the good news of forgiveness of sins and power through Christ. These convictions are the doctrines Paul employs to motivate believers to holy living. All his preaching now becomes that of a man who looks "not at the things which are seen but at the things which are unseen . . . the eternal." Constantly he reminds his hearers of the tidings entrusted to him that noonday by Damascus. In 1 Cor. 9:1 he asks "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" In 1 Cor 15:8 when he lists the appearances of the risen Jesus to his followers he adds: "And last of all as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me." In Rom 1:15 he declares that his apostleship was granted by Jesus Christ Himself and in Phil 3:12

with a graphic metaphor he declares that he "was laid hold on by Christ Jesus" as a prize is grasped by a victorious athlete. This assurance is the mainspring of the Apostle's untiring service and of his eloquent ambassadorship.

CHAPTER V

THE CRITICAL ANALYSES OF SEVEN PAULINE DISCOURSES

The present chapter considers the major addresses of Paul in the light of the classical approach to rhetorical theory. As mentioned in the Introduction, every epistle which had its origin in a situation akin to a public speaking setting is considered. Thus the epistle to the Romans has been omitted because it did not arise from the urgency of some occasion that called for persuasion. Unlike the other Paulines, Romans is more in the nature of an essay than a speech. The other criterion applied in selecting epistles for analysis was that they must be ones generally accepted as originating with the Apostle to the Gentiles. On this ground, for example, neither Ephesians or Colossians has been included, for there are some prominent scholars who attribute them to authorship other than Paul's. We are left with seven discourses--1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and Philemon.

In the following section, these seven epistles are analyzed in the order of their composition. General uniformity of opinion exists regarding the sequence of these letters with the exception of the dating for Galatians. In this particular case, we have placed the letter where we felt the weight of scholarship indicated. This chronological arrangement has some significance for the student of Paul's rhetoric as there is an evident increasing complexity of subject matter as one moves

from the earliest letters to the later. Problems began to thicken about the infant church as it grew, and these suggested the themes for Paul's messages to the churches. Thus 1 and 2 Thessalonians are relatively simple in substance, but the next letters confront us with increased involvement. Paul's life-long opponents, the Judaizers, whose purpose it was to lure the Christians back to the external observances of Judaism, figure as the particular threat to the young church at Corinth. By the time Galatians is written, it would seem that some churches were almost submerged by this heresy, while in Philippians we are confronted only with the echo of the spent controversy.

With the exception of Philemon, the two letters to the Thessalonians are the shortest of the seven, and, as has been indicated, they are also the least complex. For this reason their analyses, herein presented, are also comparatively brief, and a simplified procedure has been followed in presenting a report of their study in the light of the classical canons. Beginning with 1 Corinthians, however, the procedure of presentation has been according to the following sub-headings, or their cognates.

A survey of the occasion, indicating the particular problems responsible for the preparing of the message.

An analysis of the development of ideas, with emphasis upon logical proof.

An examination of pathetic proof.[1]

An examination of ethical proof.

An analysis of arrangement.

A statement of results.

It will be noted that in this chapter the canons of Style, Memory, and Delivery have not been considered. Obviously the epistles can

---

[1]See footnote on page 220 for statement regarding motive and emotional appeals.

afford us little help as regards the canon last named.[1] A discussion of Memory is omitted in harmony with current practice. Neither Aristotle's Rhetoric, nor the major rhetorical works from the eighteenth century onwards, give consideration to this canon. Furthermore it is impossible to prove from the epistles alone the extent to which Paul exhibited the ideal of this canon. The consideration of Style is reserved for a separate chapter inasmuch as the style does not greatly differ in essentials in the various epistles with the exception of Philemon. The last-named letter is the only one of the seven which is even semi-personal. While addressed to the small church that met at the home of Philemon, it is the slave owner himself to whom Paul chiefly speaks. The peculiar nature of the problem required tact more than authority, and thus we find Paul expressing himself in a style that is distinct in some features as far as the entire corpus of his addresses is concerned. To preserve uniformity of method, the discussion of this variation in style manifested in Philemon is also preserved for the general chapter on that canon.

In evaluating the rhetoric of Paul, we have chosen to employ most frequently the criteria presented by Thonssen and Baird in their Speech Criticism. It is felt that this volume affords an adequate expression of speech rationale which is representative also of most modern opinion in this field. Occasionally other writers on rhetoric are cited where it is considered that their words are the more illuminating in a particular instance.

---

[1]The statement by Paul's enemies regarding his delivery is considered on pages 216-217.

I. FIRST DISCOURSE TO THE CHRISTIANS AT THESSALONICA

"I adjure you by the Lord that this letter be read to all the brethren." 1 Thessalonians 5:27 RSV

This Epistle was the first Epistle written by St. Paul; and the precept he gives here, that this Epistle should be read in the public assemblies of the Church, is a specimen and pattern of what was to be done with all his Epistles. They were addressed (for the most part) not to private or particular persons, but to large public Societies, to Churches.[1]

The first portion of the New Testament to be transcribed and circulated was first delivered as a public address to Christians in ancient Salonika.

Thessalonica, like Tarsus the birthplace of Paul, was "no mean city." It was the capital of the province of Macedonia. Situated at the north-western angle of the archipelago of the Aegean Sea, this great port was also one of the largest commercial emporiums in the Roman world. A military road, the Via Egnatia, connected it with the shores of the Adriatic and Italy on the west, and with Asia on the east.

The church at Thessalonica had been raised up by Paul about A.D. 51. According to Acts 17:1-9 the Apostle had preached in the city for several weeks while simultaneously laboring night and day, working with his own hands at his trade of tent-making to support himself. The Jews of the city bribed "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort" to assault the house of the missionaries. Paul escaped, leaving Timothy to teach the new converts who were mainly Gentiles. Two years later, news came to the Apostle at Corinth concerning the believers at Thessalonica. On the whole the report was favorable.

---

[1]Christopher Wordsworth, The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In the Original Greek with Introductions and Notes. 2 Vols. (London: Rivingtons, 1872), Vol. II, 23.

According to Timothy the church abounded in faith and love. A few, however, had lapsed into the old sins against chastity and sobriety. The chief problem in the church was one which could not be solved by removing the primary cause. Dying members left their living relatives somewhat bewildered, wondering whether the former had accepted the gospel in vain. They had hoped that Christ's return would be almost immediate, but now as He tarried, His followers were dying. Death, then as now, to many appeared so permanent.

To meet the challenge of this perplexity is Paul's main objective in his message to the Thessalonians. He must persuade them that there is no necessity for despair and that their present course of faithful and loving endeavour should not be abandoned.

Logos and Pathos in I Thessalonians

> Oratory to be great must deal with ideas which make a difference in the affairs of men and states.[1]
>
> Human values can be talked about only as consisting of attitudes moving through qualitative changes in historical continuity. The effort to comprehend this "history of ideas" is at the center of speech criticism for rhetorical adaptation can be understood only on the basis of an adequate historical perspective of these germinal values.[2]

More books have been written about Paul and his concepts than about any other figure in history, Christ excepted. Harvard alone houses in its library more than one book for every year that has passed since the birth of Paul until now about this unique character and his ideas. Thus Stalker could go so far as to affirm that Paul is "the greatest thinker of his age, if not of any age,"[3] and also "We owe to him

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 332.

[2]A. J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism" Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLII (October 1956), p. 288.

[3]James Stalker, The Life of St. Paul (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.), p. 91.

hundreds of ideas which were never uttered before."[1] It is probably correct to say that the Apostle has been more often quoted than any other human being. Commentaries on each of his epistles are almost beyond number and therefore it would be impossible in this dissertation to do more than attend to the dominating concepts found in these written addresses. If men of genius like Augustine, Luther, and Calvin of past centuries and such as Monsignor Fulton Sheen of our day have expatiated with thousands of words upon a single phrase of Paul, this present analysis could hardly hope to do more than to point out the mountain peaks of his eloquence. In attempting this we encounter example after example of the intertwining of emotion and reason. Paul was never emotional for emotion's sake. Apparently he did not conceive of it consciously as a separate tool of oratory. Rather for this man, who felt deeply and thought deeply, strong emotion was the inevitable corollary of strong convictions. Thus throughout his addresses to the churches pathos and logos seem as closely and as naturally associated as the strands of a rope.

When we follow Croft's suggestion of discovering "the larger implicative meaning of the speech" with reference to Paul's message to the Thessalonians we find that the Apostle is constantly appealing to the consolations of hope based on the certainty of the Christian doctrines of the second advent and the resurrection. Says Dean Farrar about this epistle "Its key-note is Hope."[2] Thus the Greek word parousia, referring to the anticipated return of Christ, occurs six times; and every chapter makes mention of the advent, while half of the last thirty-three verses which climax the letter are descriptive of events associated with that great denouement.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 93.

[2]F. W. Farrar, The Messages of the Books (London: Macmillan and Co., 1884), p. 190. Hereafter referred to as Messages.

Typical of the Apostle's endeavour to bring consolation through hope is this passage from the heart of the letter.

> But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep. For this we declare to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command, with the archangel's call, and with the sound of the trumpet of God. And the dead in Christ will rise first; then we who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so we shall always be with the Lord. Therefore comfort one another with these words.
>
> 1 Thess 4:13-18 RSV

Paul's argument is that the resurrection of Christ, believed in by those to whom he wrote, robbed death of its separating power and of its finality. If Jesus died and rose again, Paul is saying, then it logically follows that He also can resurrect others who have fallen into the tomb. Furthermore Paul argues that his own message is "the word of the Lord" and therefore to be unhesitatingly believed. In consequence those who accepted him as a spokesman for the Most High need not sorrow as others who had no hope. His argument here is based on authority and was well adapted to those who already had chosen to believe his claims.

The Apostle is not content to merely refer to the advent. He describes the cry of command, the sounding of the last trump, the call of the archangel. He pictures the rising of the dead and the translating of the living believers and ends on the note of eternal fellowship with each other and with God. "So" he says, "we shall always be with the Lord." Certainly he is not giving way to inordinate emotionalism when he adds "Therefore comfort one another with these words."

This is a typical example of the Apostle's intertwining of logic and emotion. The emotion grows out of the facts implied by his logic. It is emotion which he himself shares as part and parcel of his own clear convictions.

The study of 1 Thessalonians reveals a recurring emphasis upon this theme of hope, and in each case logical and pathetic implications are linked. He mentions hope in the very first sentence that follows his introductory blessing. He refers to his gratitude to God as he remembered the "steadfastness of hope" of the believers. At the end of this chapter he exults over the way they had turned from idols "to serve a living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come." In the next chapter Paul reminds them that God has called each of them to inherit "his own kingdom and glory," and concludes this section by saying--"for what is our hope or joy or crown of boasting before our Lord Jesus at his coming? Is it not you? For you are our glory and joy." Note the emphasis again on the words "hope" and "coming." In the corresponding place of the next chapter the refrain is similar as he again points to "the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints."

In chapter four occurs the passage first quoted describing graphically the advent of Christ and the resurrection. Beginning with these verses the refrain becomes the controlling factor of the remainder of the message and is associated with the conclusion as with the introduction. "May your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The prayer may be regarded as the peak of his peroration, for only the subdued hush of salutation succeeds it.

When we first consider Paul's emphasis upon hope, we are not greatly impressed for this virtue has become a commonplace in

Christian civilization. A little consideration however of Graeco-Roman culture changes our opinion. Gibbon the historian affirmed that the Christian stress upon hope was one of the five causes of Christianity's conquest of paganism. He so declares because the pagans of Paul's day were almost wholly devoid of hope. From the commencement of Greek civilization most Greek thinkers had rung the changes of pessimism.

For example, into the mouth of Achilles Homer placed these words--

> Dont recommend death to me; I would prefer in the fields to be a day-labourer for another, with a man who has no land of his own, who has not much of a living, rather than rule over all the dead.[1]

In Theognis we read--

> It is best of all things for the children of men not to be born, nor to see the rays of keen sunlight; but if born to pass as soon as may be the gates of Hades, and to lie beneath a vesture of much earth.[2]

And from Euripides--

> It were better that we should call our friends together to lament over the newly-born, that he has come to such a world of sorrows.[3]
>
> And when a man is dead and has found rest from trouble, we should rejoice and carry him from the house with songs of gladness.[3]

And Pindar--

> To and fro toss the hopes of man, cleaving the waste foam-drift of a perfidious sea. No man upon earth has found a sure token from heaven of how it shall fare with him. Warnings of what will come are wrapt in blind darkness.[4]

---

[1]Homer, Odyssey XI, cited by Wilbur Smith, Therefore Stand (Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1945), p. 241.

[2]Theognis, Elegies, . 425, cited by Wilbur Smith, p. 242.

[3]Euripides, Orisphontes, cited by Wilbur Smith, p. 242.

[4]Pindar, Olympian, XII. I., cited by Wilbur Smith, p. 242.

Cicero--

> If there miseries are to be permanent, I only wish, my dearest, to see you as soon as possible and to die in your arms, since neither gods, whom you have worshipped with such pure devotion, nor men, whom I have always served, have made us any return.[1]

Pliny--

> There is nothing certain save that nothing is certain, and there is no more wretched and yet arrogant being than man. The best thing which has been given to man amid the many torments of this life is, that he can take his own life.[2]

Many there were throughout the Roman world who believed as did these representative thinkers. Large numbers put into practice the hint of Pliny, and suicide was a common road to death.

These statements enable us to read Paul's words more nearly as they were received by their first listeners. The consolations Paul offered were breathtakingly new in the first century of our era, and it is impossible to conceive of more efficient rhetorical themes than the employment of these in the message to the bewildered Thessalonians.

It thus becomes apparent that our examination of Paul's approach in this letter places us at a very significant point in that "history of ideas" which Croft declares "is at the center of speech criticism." We have in this epistle to the Thessalonians the first recorded emphasis upon a virtue which was to become a moulding influence on the world of subsequent centuries.

According to psychiatrist Karl Menninger, this particular virtue is needed more than ever in this present age. He asserts that many of mankind's troubles are as much due to the absence of hope as to the

---

[1]Cicero, Ad Familiares XIV.4.I., cited by Wilbur Smith, p. 242.

[2]Pliny, Natural History II.7.(5).XXVIII.1.(2), cited by Wilbur Smith, p. 242.

evils of "selfishness, vengefulness, hate, greed, cruelty, destructiveness and even self-destructiveness." Writing in the American Journal of Psychiatry, Menninger adds--

> Our shelves hold many books now on the place of faith in science and psychiatry, and on the vicissitudes of man's efforts to love and to be loved. But when it comes to hope, our shelves are bare. The Encyclopaedia Britannica devotes many columns to the topic of love, and many more to faith. But . . . poor little hope . . . is not even listed. . . .
>
> It was intrepid indeed of St. Paul . . . to declare that hope should stand along with love.

Dr. Menninger further asserts that the best thing that psychiatrists can do for their patients is to "light for them a candle of hope to show them possibilities that may become sound expectations."[1] It would seem that there is some modern support for the value of the concept Paul urged upon the Thessalonians in his address of two thousand years ago.

It is highly unlikely that Paul would have achieved his objective had he declared to the sorrowing believers a message similar to the following one from philosopher Bertrand Russell.

> That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes, and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labors of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins--all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. Only within the scaffolding of these truths, only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built.[2]

---

[1]Time, Dec. 28, 1959.

[2]Bertrand Russell, Mysticism and Logic (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1949), pp. 47-48.

While it is impossible to demonstrate the certainty of Paul's predictions concerning the second advent and the resurrection, yet it is obvious that his skillful presentation of these as the foundation for hope was competent rhetorical invention.

Paul's critic needs to remember that good judgment demands

> . . . no greater certainty of proof in a given case than the data available and the nature of the field of discussion warrant. To be satisfied with little rigor in mathematics would be inferiority in intellectual standards. But equally to demand dogmatic certainty in practical realms bespeaks a bigotry which is reprehensible. A sense of fitness must operate here as elsewhere.[1]

Character of Paul as Reflected in His Message to The Thessalonians

It is possible that in the written addresses of St. Paul we have the best examples of ethos in ancient oratory. It cannot be too strongly affirmed that Paul never conveyed ideas merely. He also conveyed himself. Farrar has said that in the first epistle to the Thessalonians "a loving fatherly spirit breathes in every line." Apparently some calumniators had been at work and Paul found it necessary to defend himself. The defense, with few parallels in literature, has strong ethical appeal.

> For you yourselves know, brethren, that our visit to you was not in vain; but though we had already suffered and been shamefully treated at Philippi, as you know, we had courage in our God to declare to you the gospel of God in the face of great opposition. For our appeal does not spring from error or uncleanness, nor is it made with guile; but just as we have been approved by God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, not to please men, but to please God who tests our hearts. For we never used either words of flattery, as you know, or a cloak for greed, as

---

[1]Albert E. Avey, The Functions and Forms of Thought, pp. 368-369, quoted by Thonssen and Baird, p. 356.

> God is witness; nor did we seek glory from men, whether from you or from others, though we might have made demands as apostles of Christ. But we were gentle among you, like a nurse taking care of her children. So being affectionately desirous of you, we were ready to share with you not only the gospel of God but also our own selves, because you had become very dear to us.
>
> For you remember our labor and toil, brethren; we worked night and day, that we might not burden any of you, while we preached to you the gospel of God. You are witnesses, and God also, how holy and righteous and blameless, was our behavior to you believers; for you know how, like a father with his children, we exhorted each one of you and encouraged you and charged you to lead a life worthy of God. . . . 2:1-12 RSV

It is doubtful that any rhetorical manual exists containing a better example of ethos than the above. How tenderly, delicately does the Apostle remind his hearers of the behaviour of their former missionaries. Their courage, sincerity, and love are manifested in such a way that the listening Thessalonians with hearts warming once more towards Paul and his helpers would be prepared to receive the counsel that followed. The allusion to self supporting labour in this context is particularly striking inasmuch as the time of Paul's preaching in Thessalonica had been a time of famine throughout the empire when the common necessities of life had mounted in price to six times their usual value. In such a crisis it would have been an almost overwhelming temptation for any one of the mercenary quack teachers who swarmed throughout every city to eat another's bread rather than undertake the taxing labour required to secure his own.

The preceding quotation is only one of several in this epistle which demonstrate the powerful ethical persuasion employed by the apostolic preacher. He seemed to do intuitively what polished rhetoricians have laboured to accomplish.

Structure of the Address

This is an aspect of Paul's oratory that leaves much room for improvement. There are instances in the epistles of an apparently bewildering lack of order and arrangement.

One explanation for this is the extempore nature of the messages. Ancient orators were mainly wary of extempore addresses. Even Demosthenes was shy of such work. The writings of Paul were born in the midst of a life almost unbelievably busy and they were never intended by their author to be enduring literature. Furthermore as we shall later notice in detail Paul cared little for laboured schemes of structure. The jewel, not its casket, concerned him.

It is not meant to suggest by the foregoing that Paul's addresses are chaotic. This is far from the case. Nevertheless it has to be admitted that there are entire letters such as 2nd Corinthians and Philippians which almost defy the possibility of discovering in them any logical structural arrangement. Such addresses constitute the spontaneous outpouring of the Apostle's heart wherein a primary purpose is readily perceivable but where also digressive tributaries of thought are given free course.

In almost all cases the written addresses of Paul are capable of a sixfold analysis, namely (1) the greeting, (2) the thanksgiving, (3) the doctrinal portion, (4) the section of practical application, (5) personal messages, and (6) the farewell. There are inherent values in such arrangement. Sections one and two always serve to relink the Apostle's heart to his listeners' as he refers to his present situation in his perilous evangelistic course and then finds some good thing to commend in those whom he addresses. The next section embodies the statement and proof as Paul without further ado names the existing problem and

proceeds to indicate the doctrinal principles which indicate the solution. The practical portion applies that which immediately precedes and here the message is always searching, personal and definitive of action. The messages to individuals come next and they serve to soften any preceding sternness and to reveal Paul as a tender father over his spiritual children and a good shepherd of the flock which he knows even to the individual names of its members.

In no instance is it difficult to find lucid thematic emergence, but there are instances where a modern critic could justly point to lengthy digressions in the body of the speech which mar the proportionate development of the central theme. These cases will be indicated particularly in the study of 2nd Corinthians and Philippians. It should also be noted that where the structure is not classically balanced the failure is always due to excessive materials rather than a paucity of matter.

Thonssen and Baird have pointed out that the critic of structure "appraises the total organizational plan with reference to the peculiar audience conditions to which it was presumably accommodated. In other words the critic recognizes the possibility that a speech may be a masterful combination of discrete elements. . . ."[1] Remembering the circumstances under which the busy Apostle sent his messages and recognizing his desire to accomplish more than one purpose with his infrequent correspondence the critic finds his explanation of the Pauline structural deficiencies. Thonssen and Baird also suggest that--

> The critic may find here, as elsewhere, that an attempt to reduce rhetoric to a set of rules, either on the creative or the critical side, is a venture in futility. Many effective speeches stand as refutation of the claim that a particular way of organizing materials must be followed.[2]

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 393.

[2]Ibid., p. 401.

In the first epistle to the Thessalonians the structure is clear-cut. There are two main divisions, one personal and full of reminiscences of the past, and the other doctrinal and hortatory with its main emphasis on present conduct in view of coming events. The first section is embraced by the first three chapters and the second section in the closing two chapters. The usual six features of the Pauline letters can be found here but in this address the personal and practical elements are blended throughout.

The letter is a unity as has been demonstrated earlier by the tracing of the theme throughout each chapter. The first section with its emphasis on ethos paves the way for the second with its practical admonitions. The latter are made the automatic outgrowth of the doctrines discussed in the fourth chapter, namely the second advent and the resurrection. Thus by logic based on the premises of authority and revelation the Apostle powerfully motivates his flock to earnestly and hopefully maintain their Christian walk.

Results of the Message

It is not always possible to discover the results of Paul's messages, but in this instance the outcome is clearly stated. Within a few weeks the Apostle received news from Thessalonica. On the whole it was favourable; and on sending his second letter his introduction is one of unusual fervour expressing his appreciation of their growth in faith and love.

> We are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren, as is fitting, because your faith is growing abundantly, and the love of every one of you for one another is increasing. Therefore we ourselves boast of you in the churches of God for your steadfastness and faith in all your persecutions and in the afflictions which you are enduring. 2 Thess. 1:3, 4 RSV

It is noteworthy that in this second epistle he has no need to repeat his admonitions regarding chastity and obedience. Apparently Paul judged from the news he had received that his prior counsels had been received and applied.

II. SECOND DISCOURSE TO THE CHRISTIANS AT THESSALONICA

While the first letter of Paul had been read to the Thessalonian church with beneficial results, a minority group by wrongly applying a single word of the epistle veered towards fanaticism.

In his message of hope to the bereaved in Thessalonica the Apostle had emphasized that at the advent of Christ the righteous dead would be raised and restored to their loved ones. Speaking of those who would be living at the day of Christ's appearing, he had said--". . . we who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds." 1 Thess 4:17 RSV. The first word, "we," was to have repercussions that Paul had never contemplated. It was seized upon as meaning that the Apostle himself expected Christ to come in his own life time, perhaps at any moment. Why then be engrossed in worldly duties? There is but one obligation and that is to be ready for Christ's appearance in the clouds. So thought some of the Thessalonians. They gave up their worldly labours and depended on the charity of others. Paul's word "we" was the excuse for this behaviour. This was the report that reached Paul not many weeks after his despatch of the first epistle.

To meet this situation was not quite as simple as it would first appear. He could not recant regarding the hope of Christ's coming. Not only would this be morally impossible but it would erase the benefits of his earlier message, where he had inspired hope and given consolation by means of this particular doctrine. Secondly, he could not correct the mistaken minority by asserting that while the Advent was certain it was not near. Paul himself had no fixed idea upon the time of the coming of Christ. He was familiar with the Latter's own statement--"of that day and hour knoweth no man," but he was also aware that Christ had made His second coming a teaching of primary importance throughout His ministry.

The stress by some on the pronoun "we" as proving that Paul believed he would witness the grand denouement cannot be validated. Readers of the past and present who have used such an argument have forgotten that Paul also wrote the statement--"He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus." 2 Cor 4:14. If we used the same exegesis here as in 1 Thess 4:17 we would have the Apostle declaring that he expected to be both dead and alive when the last trump sounded. It is obvious that in both cases Paul is using the pronoun generically as it is found elsewhere. (See 1 Cor 15:51 and 1 Cor 6:14)

How then was the Apostle to persuade the misguided ones to live soberly yet withal retaining their hope in the coming of Christ? He does so by asserting the necessity of obedience to the dictum of Christ--"Occupy till I come." Lu 19:13. Paul meets the issue by declaring that prophecy showed that there were prior events to take place before the advent and in view of this, Christians were to prepare by patiently and faithfully fulfilling life's common duties as sacred to the Lord.

> . . . the main object of his second letter was to control into calm, and shame into diligence, the gossiping enthusiasm which fatally tended towards irregularity and sloth. They were not to desert the hard road of the present for the mirage which seemed to bring so close to them the green Edens of the future; they were not to sacrifice the sacredness of immediate duty for the dreamy sweetness of unrealised expectations.[1]

Because Christians have always looked upon themselves as only pilgrims in this transitory world, it was no easy matter to persuade concerning the importance, the sacredness, and the necessity of faithfully accomplishing the humdrum duties of daily living. Human nature is always prone to live in the future or past rather than the present and Christian human nature had the same weakness. In the counsel given to offset this tendency we find evidence of the practical common sense of Paul. He was no dreamy mystic such as the vernacular describes by the reference to one who is "so heavenly minded as to be of no earthly use."

It is easy to trace Paul's psychology of approach in this letter. In the first chapter he praises God for the faithfulness of the Thessalonians as a church and he repeats the hope that had been the emphasis of his preceding letter. He speaks of "rest . . . when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven . . . when he comes on that day to be glorified in his saints, and to be marveled at in all who have believed, because our testimony to you was believed." 2 Thess 1:7-10. Thus he reaffirms his previous position and in effect declares that though some have perverted a glorious truth the reality is not to be repudiated. In fact this second letter like the first makes reference to the advent in every chapter.

Next he goes to the very heart of the matter.

---

[1]Farrar, Life and Work of St. Paul, p. 340.

> Now concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our assembling to meet him, we beg you, brethren, not to be quickly shaken in mind or excited, either by spirit or by word, or by letter purporting to be from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord has come. Let no one deceive you in any way; for that day will not come, unless the rebellion comes first, and the man of lawlessness is revealed, the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God . . . And you know what is restraining him now so that he may be revealed in his time.
> 2 Thess 2:1-6. RSV

Thus Paul brings to the remembrance of his hearers the Old Testament prophecies concerning the Antichrist who would precede the setting up of the kingdom of God. He reminds the Thessalonians that he had told them of this matter when he was with them. In effect he says, I am confident that you will understand what I am saying on this matter and accept it because not only is this foretold in the books of the prophets but I so instructed you when I was with you two years ago.

After his reference to the advent in the first section (chapter) of his letter Paul had expressed the hope that the Thessalonians through the power of God would fulfil every good work with faithfulness. (1:11). Now again after his discussion of the Antichrist he repeats this admonition with the prayer that the believers might be established "in every good work and word." 2 Thess 2:16. Thus gently does he pave the way for his stronger admonition to the wayward who had been neglectful of good works.

In the third and last chapter we read:

> And we have confidence in the Lord about you, that you are doing and will do the things which we command. May the Lord direct your hearts . . . to the steadfastness of Christ. 3:4, 5 RSV

These words with their courteous expression of confidence and their tactful allusion to steadfastness constitute the last softening touch before the strong and direct appeal concerning those in error.

> Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you keep away from any brother who is living in idleness and not in accord with the tradition that you received from us. For you yourselves know how you ought to imitate us; we were not idle when we were with you, we did not eat any one's bread without paying, but with toil and labor we worked night and day, that we might not burden any of you. It was not because we have not that right, but to give you in our conduct an example to imitate. For even when we were with you, we gave you this command; If any one will not work, let him not eat. For we hear that some of you are living in idleness, mere busybodies, not doing any work.
>
> Now such persons we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ to do their work in quietness and to earn their own living. Brethren, do not be weary in well-doing. 3:6-13 RSV

This section provides also the strongest evidences of ethos to be found in this epistle. While the very first sentences of the letter stressed the Apostle's sincere love for his converts, these last words remind them of the practical evidences of that love, namely his unselfish behaviour when among them. The third constituent of ethical proof, competence, is manifested throughout the whole epistle by the sure authoritative touch and practical counsel.

Emotional appeal is found early in this address. Immediately following the greeting and the thanksgiving, Paul refers to the suffering of this church because of persecution. He promises future rest and vindication, and paints a graphic picture of that event on which all their hopes were centered--"when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire . . . ."

The comprehensive benediction of peace was also calculated to act as a soothing balm following his immediately preceding stern admonitions. "Now may the Lord of peace himself give you peace at all times in all ways."

Reviewing the integrity of ideas found in this second address to the Thessalonians, we are first of all impressed that Paul's approach

to the emergency situation was not one of the makeshift variety. He selected as his theme the sacredness of the duties of everyday life in view of our ignorance regarding the exact time of the end of all things. We find that the same doctrine occurs elsewhere in Paul. For example--"And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men." "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." "Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." In each case the Apostle renders the so-called "common" life sacred. It is particularly significant that the first sentence quoted above was addressed to Christians who were slaves. Labour, however humble, is thus glorified by the teaching of the Apostle, and the influence of this concept through the centuries has been beyond measure. Monasticism and a thousand other irregularities might have been avoided if the Apostle's thought had been understood. Many are the writers who have gained inspiration from this concept and publicised it to the world. Herbert had this in mind when he wrote

> "Who sweeps a room as for thy laws,
> Makes that and th' action fine."[1]

W. C. Gannett's classic essay Blessed be Drudgery and multitudinous other works could be cited as flowing from the same spring.

Arrangement

This letter follows the usual six-fold pattern of Paul's epistles. The greeting is found in 1:1, 2. The Thanksgiving is presented in verses three to twelve of the same chapter. In the second chapter we have the doctrinal discussion of the Man of Sin. The last chapter is practical in its admonitions, and it is followed as usual by the final salutation and benediction in the concluding verses.

---

[1]George Herbert "The Elixir" I, 19. The Works of George Herbert in Prose and Verse, edited by Robert Aris Willmott (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1857).

Results

Nothing whatever is definitely known regarding the immediate results of this second letter of Paul's to the Thessalonians.

III. THE FIRST DISCOURSE TO THE CORINTHIANS

The "thoughtful study of the historical pattern in which speeches are set" has always been recommended by speech critics. The necessity for this injunction is demonstrated immediately as one grapples with Paul's first address to the Corinthians.

> Only the original recipients of these letters could catch every intimation in Paul's words. We of today meet one difficulty after another in our attempts at projecting ourselves back into the situation as it existed in Corinth.[1]

Only the understanding of the environment of the church at Corinth can provide us with the keys necessary for interpreting this message, and present us with some insight regarding the nature of Paul's audience. With this knowledge as a background, it becomes a simpler task to appraise the speechcraft of the evangelical persuader.

The Occasion

The city of Corinth was the capital of Southern Greece, then known as the Roman province of Achaia. It was the Vanity Fair of the Empire, and the London and Paris of the first century of our era. Contemporaries referred to it as "the star of Hellas," "the gate of the Peloponnesus," and "the bridge of the sea," these two latter expressions referring to its strategic position on the Grecian isthmus between the Morea and the Continent. In fact, it is from this particular isthmus that the word has been extended to name every similar neck of land throughout the

---

[1]Richard C. H. Lenski, Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1935), p. 7.

entire world. Corinth thus had two harbours, one leading to the east, and the other to the west. Its strategic position as a commercial and industrial center had no parallel in the Roman world. As regards transport from Rome and Italy to Asia Minor and Syria, Corinth was directly on the main route. The first triremes of the Greeks are connected with Corinth's history. One of the chief local gods was Neptune, and Corinthian colonies were scattered over distant coasts throughout the west and east. From every sea, ships came to her harbours, and Corinth thus became the habitual resort and the universal Greek market. Many from among her population of 400,000 were employed in the manufactures in metallurgy, dyeing, and porcelain, associated with the import and export trade.

The famous Isthmian games regularly brought multitudes of strangers. About a century and a half before Paul, the city had been largely destroyed because of its leadership of the Achaian league against Rome. For a hundred years the city was little more than a ruin until in 46 B.C. Julius Caesar had it rebuilt and made a Roman colony. By Paul's day the city was experiencing a period of unparalleled prosperity, and with the flood of wealth and commerce had come also a flood of vice and materialism. Farrar aptly describes what the scene must have been when the pioneer of the gospel entered it.

> Splendid buildings, enriched with ancient pillars of marble and porphyry, and adorned with gold and silver, soon began to rise side by side with the wretched huts of wood and straw which sheltered the mass of the poorer population. Commerce became more and more active. Objects of luxury soon found their way to the marts, which were visited by every nation of the civilized world--Arabian balsam, Egyptian papyrus, Phoenician dates, Libyan ivory, Babylonian carpets, Cilician goats'-hair, Lycaonian wool, Phygian slaves. With riches came superficial refinement and literary tastes. The life of the wealthier inhabitants was marked by self-indulgence and intellectual restlessness, and the mass of the people, even down to the slaves, were more or

less affected by the prevailing tendency. . . .

It was into the midst of this mongrel and heterogeneous population of Greek adventurers and Roman bourgeois, with a tainting infusion of Phoenicians--this mass of Jews, ex-soldiers, philosophers, merchants, sailors, freedmen, slaves, tradespeople, hucksters, and agents of every form of vice--a colony "without aristocracy, without traditions, without well-established citizens"--that the toil-worn Jewish wanderer made his way.[1]

The same writer has given a comprehensive picture of the moral condition of the city.

> But there was one characteristic of heathen life which would come home to him at Corinth with overwhelming force, and fill his pure soul with infinite pain. It was the gross immorality of a city conspicuous for its depravity even amid the depraved cities of a dying heathenism. Its very name had become a synonym for reckless debauchery. This abysmal profligacy of Corinth was due partly to the influx of sailors, who made it a trysting-place for the vices of every land, and partly to the vast numerical superiority of the slaves, of which, two centuries later, the city was said to contain many myriads. And so far from acting as a check upon this headlong immorality, religion had there taken under its immediate protection the very pollutions which it was its highest function to suppress. A thousand Hierodouloi were consecrated to the service of Impurity in the infamous Temple of Aphrodite Pandemos. The Lais of old days, whose tomb at Corinth had been marked by a Sphinx with a human head between her claws, had many shameless and rapacious representatives. East and west mingled their dregs of foulness in the new Gomorrah of classic culture, and the orgies of the Paphian goddess were as notorious as those of Isis or of Asherah.[2]

The citadel of Corinth was located in an almost impregnable position, situated as it was upon the Acro-Corinthus, a great mass of rock which rose to a height of 1,800 feet. Perhaps it was the extensive east and west view from here that suggested to Paul the strategic importance of the city as the site for a strong Christian church.

---

[1]F. W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1880), p. 315.

[2]Ibid., p. 316.

From the summit it was possible to view the Acropolis of Athens forty-five miles away; and being reminded of his only slight success there, the Apostle no doubt yearned for a missionary center from which Athens could be conquered for the gospel. Paul apparently planned to stay longer at Corinth than at any other city he had yet visited, and because of this he early established himself in a home, and at his old trade. Priscilla and Aquila, from among the Jews expelled from Rome by Claudius, became the intimate associates of Paul. Probably this couple was already Christian, as we have no story of their conversion.

Following his custom, Paul began his preaching in the synagogue; but when the usual opposition became apparent, he used the house adjoining as his meeting place. The record declares that Crispus, ruler of the synagogue, joined the new group of believers. It would appear from 1 Cor 1:14 that Paul personally baptised this eminent convert. By this time Silas and Timothy had reached Paul's side from Macedonia. Together with the Apostle, after he had spent eighteen months in evangelism, they faced a new threat from the Jews, when the latter appealed to a recently arrived successor to the former proconsul. Gallio was the brother of the famous Seneca, and apparently his own philosophy was broad and tolerant. He drove the Jews out of his court and did not prevent the mob from taking hold of Sosthenes, the main opponent of the new teaching, and beating him. Sosthenes had been elected as successor to Crispus. Amid such exciting events the Christian church, constituted of converted Jews and Gentiles, took root and began to grow.

While the inspirational figure of Paul was by the side of the new members, they prospered; but to remain steadfast in the midst of so many attractions of their former mode of living when the Apostle left

was another matter. During the three years absence of its founder, the "vision splendid" began to fade. The believers were daily in sight and hearing of all that was contrary to their new profession. It was hard to believe that the things which were seen were only temporal, and thus the city began to reconvert some of those whom it had apparently lost.

It was a Jewish Christian named Apollos who brought this news to Paul. Immediately the agitated Apostle sent a letter to the church warning its members not to associate with the immoral. Thus we read in 1 Cor 5:9 the words: "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators." As for the actual letter, it no longer exists. It was one of many apostolic messages which were not preserved for the sacred canon by the Christian church because their content was deemed local and temporal in application. In reply to this message from Paul, the Corinthian church returned a self-complacent epistle containing requests for counsel on a number of practical issues but not mentioning their true condition and basic needs. With reference to this word from the Greek believers we read at the commencement of a new section in 1 Corinthians: "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me. . . ." (1 Cor 7:1). Judging from an allusion made by Paul in his first chapter (1:11), however, the discerning Apostle did not accept the Corinthian letter at its face value. Apparently he closely questioned those who had conveyed the letter from the church, and in this way he learned far more than from their epistle. Furthermore, he sought out a Corinthian family by the name of Chloe who had moved to Ephesus, and from them were gathered further details regarding the backslidden state of their home-church. He was informed that schism, strife, irreverent behavior at worship services, heresy, and legalising Judaists threatened to disintegrate the Christian congregation at Corinth. Only of minor significance were the issues raised by the Greeks in their

letter. For example, their questions included the following:

1. A series of inquiries regarding marriage. Was married life in itself a bad thing, or at least undesirable? Was celibacy a more worthy condition? If persons were already married, would it be best to live as though they were unmarried? Was it right for widows and widowers to marry again? Should mixed marriages between Christians and pagans be tolerated, or ought a Christian partner to repudiate the relationship and separate?

2. What should their relationship be to idolatrous festivals, and the purchasing of cheap foods which had been used in pagan worship? Should they go as guests to the homes of pagan friends and relations, thus taking the risk that food placed before them may have been offered to idols?

3. In church assemblies should women be permitted to worship with their heads uncovered? Were women to be allowed to speak or teach publicly in the church?

4. As regards spiritual gifts, how important was the gift of speaking in tongues? What should be done if several in the public assembly began to exercise their gifts or assumed gifts at the same time?

5. Was the resurrection to be only something spiritual or did it apply to the body?

6. What plans should they make regarding the collection of gifts for the poor believers in Judea?

Paul's reply to the Corinthians not only gives counsel on each of these matters, but also it admonishes the church regarding the disorders they had not mentioned, but concerning which Paul had learned

from other sources. The latter issues included the following:

1. The church had become split up into factions. One group claimed Peter as its head; another took the name of Paul, and yet another claimed itself to be the Christ party. A fourth group declared themselves to be followers of Apollos.

2. Some Judaizing Christian teachers had appeared who poured contempt upon Paul. They accused him of making void the Jewish ceremonial law. They asserted that Paul had never claimed financial support from the church because he recognized his own insecure position, unlike other Apostles such as Peter, who claimed the financial support of believers rather than participate in secular labour.[1] Paul was only a prating tent-maker without true apostolic authority, suggested some Corinthians. He had not even kept his promise about returning to see them.

3. The Agapē had degenerated from the reverent ritual taught by Paul to an irreverent and, at times, blasphemous gathering. The Corinthians had been taught to share their provisions at a communal feast and then to partake of the symbolic bread and wine. As it now was, the rich were bringing luxurious fare, and neglecting the exercise of charity towards their less fortunate brethren. Some were guilty of partaking of the Sacrament while half-intoxicated.

4. One church member was living with his stepmother in illicit union, and the church as a whole did nothing about this

---

[1] 1 Cor 9:4-7 makes it clear that most of the Apostles accepted financial support from the churches for whom they laboured. Paul specifically mentions that this was the practice of Peter.

dereliction, probably because many others in the church were participating in sins of impurity.

This report, gleaned by Paul from visitors from Corinth, when combined with the questions sent by the church, provides a partial picture at least of the audience to which the Apostle must now shape his discourse. Only a very strong character would refuse to be discouraged at the news of this apparent collapse of his work. Paul could have uttered a wait of despair and washed his hands of the fickle Corinthians. Or he might have sent them a burning vehement letter of reproach consigning them all to perdition. The fact that he chose to do neither of these things tells us much concerning the spiritual stature of the tent-maker. Instead he dictated an address to the backsliders which is a model of practical good-sense, forbearance, and love. His message sprang straight from the heart. He himself tells us that he composed it in agony of mind and amid many tears.

> Even his most elaborate Epistles were in reality not elaborate. They leapt like vivid sparks from a heart in which the fire of love to God burnt until death with an ever brighter and brighter flame.[1]

> . . . the very writings which spring most naturally and spontaneously from a noble and sincere emotion, are often those that produce the deepest impression upon the world, and are less likely to be resented--at any rate, are more likely to be useful--than the tutored and polished utterances which are carefully tamed down into the limits of correct conventionality. Not only the Church of Corinth, but the whole world, has gained from the intensity of the Apostle's feelings, and the impetuous spontaneity of the language in which they were expressed.[2]

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 384.

[2]Ibid., p. 401.

Analysis of the Development of Ideas, with Particular Emphasis on Logos

It is obvious that to correct the manifold disorders of the audience which Paul was addressing would be no easy task. What plan did the Apostle adopt?

One is first impressed regarding the plan he did not adopt. If one studies the somewhat similar letter sent by Gregory the Great to St. Augustine in reply to enquiries regarding the management of the English converts, it will be found that Gregory was decisive and minute about even the smallest details of conduct. This is not true of Paul in this epistle. He chooses, rather, to suggest first principles to his hearers in order that they might learn how to decide individually in even the smallest issues of daily living. He does not relieve them of the necessity of making their own decisions in doubtful matters of behaviour, but urges them to that maturity of character whereby every problem finds its solution as it is subjected to the test of a major principle of morality. For example, when dealing with the problem of schism in the church, Paul purposely refrains from associating himself with any of the divisions. He refrains from saying which groups are in the wrong. Instead he declares that the Church of God is holy, and that whoever brings damage to it in any way will thus destroy himself.

> Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you? If any one destroys God's temple, God will destroy him. For God's temple is holy, and that temple you are. 1 Cor 3:16, 17. RSV

Similarly, inasmuch as the schismatics had magnified the different abilities of their respective leaders, and contended for one man above the others, Paul purposefully minimizes the importance of human agencies and exalts God.

> What then is Apollos? What is Paul? Servants through whom you believed, as the Lord assigned to each. I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth. So neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but only God who gives the growth. He who plants and he who waters are equal, and each shall receive his wages according to his labor. For we are fellow workmen for God; you are God's field, God's building. 1 Cor 3:5-9 RSV
>
> So let no one boast of men. For all things are yours, whether Paul or Cephas or the world or life or death or the present or the future, all are yours; and you are Christ's and Christ is God's. 1 Cor 3:21-23 RSV
>
> For who sees anything different in you? What have you that you did not receive? If then you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift? 1 Cor 4:7 RSV

The problem of immorality is met by pointing out the sacredness of the human body. It belongs to Christ and therefore can not be prostituted. One day the body is to be resurrected.

> The body is not meant for immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. And God raised the Lord and will also raise us up by his power. Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I therefore take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute? Never! Do you not know that he who joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her? For, as it is written "The two shall become one." But he who is united to the Lord becomes one spirit with him. . . . Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost within you, which you have from God? You are not your own; you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body. 1 Cor 6:13-20 RSV

It would have been impossible to provide stronger incentives to purity than these--the principles of union with Christ, of being indwelt by the Holy Spirit, of being the redeemed possession of God bought by the blood of Christ. Whether we agree with the principles here enunciated has little to do with their appropriateness in the argument of the Apostle. His hearers had previously acknowledged the validity of such principles and would do so again.

In answering the queries concerning marriage, again, the Apostle lays down principles, rather than detailed injunctions, regarding behaviour. In those matters where Christ had not given specific instruction, Paul leaves every man free to be "fully persuaded in his own mind" and to obey the right as God gave him to see the right. While Paul is often accused of having the attitude of an ascetic regarding marriage, the close study of 1 Cor 7:2-7 in the Greek or in any reputable modern version is found to lend no support to this view. He declares:

> The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband. 1 Cor 7:3 RSV

While he points out that celibacy has advantages, he also stresses its disadvantages in verses two and nine of this chapter. His apparent favouring of celibacy needs to be viewed with reference to the troubled state of the times and the peculiar conditions of the most corrupt city in Greece. Throughout this chapter the underlying thought is that expressed in verses 15 and 24.

> . . . God has called us to peace.
> So, brethren, in whatever state each was called, there let him remain with God.

Thus he warns against the excessive scrupulosity of those who felt they should separate from unbelieving partners.

The primary principle to guide all is found in verses 29-31. Here he declares that all things are to be done with the understanding of the temporary and preparatory nature of this earthly existence.

> I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short; from now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none, and those who mourn as though they were not mourning, and those who rejoice as though they were not rejoicing, and those who buy as though they had no goods, and those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it. For the form of this world is passing away. RSV

The principle expressed in these words is that all temporal matters are to be subjected to the eternal and ever placed in a secondary status.

The supreme test that Paul suggests for indifferent matters, such as the use of foods offered to idols, is the test of love. The Corinthians had boasted by letter to Paul that "all of us possess knowledge" and therefore could they not please themselves in this matter. In reply the Apostle says:

> Now concerning food offered to idols: we know that "all of us possess knowledge." "Knowledge" puffs us, but love builds up. If any one imagines that he knows something, he does not yet know as he ought to know. But if one loves God, one is known by him. Hence, as to the eating of food offered to idols, we know that "an idol has no real existence," and that "there is no God but one." . . . However not all possess this knowledge. . . . Only take care lest this liberty of yours somehow become a stumbling-block to the weak. For if any one sees you, a man of knowledge, at table in an idol's temple, might he not be encouraged, if his conscience is weak, to eat food offered to idols? . . . Thus, sinning against your brethren and wounding their conscience when it is weak, you sin against Christ.
>
> 1 Cor 8:1-2 RSV

Thus the Apostle asserts the principle that love, not our so-called rights, is to govern us in all matters. Next he skillfully employs the same argument in defense of himself against the accusations of the visiting Judaizers. They had declared that Paul must have felt his own authority to be insecure inasmuch as he had not claimed support from the church at Corinth. Now Paul applies his preceding argument in this matter, pointing out that he also had foregone his rights in order to build up the church. This next section defends his apostolicity, the privileges associated therewith as rightfully his, and explains his self-supporting ministry while at Corinth. In these and following verses Paul contends for his rights, using the following arguments.

1. Arguments from the analogies of the soldier, husbandman, and shepherd.

2. Argument from the use of an Old Testament Scripture.

3. Argument from the natural law of gratitude for received benefits.

4. Argument from the practices in the Jewish Temple whereby the priests received as food a share in the sacrifices.

5. Argument from Christ's own rule.

Then he declares that despite his right to financial support he had not availed himself of it lest he hinder the progress of the gospel.

> What then is my reward? Just this: that in my preaching I may make the gospel free of charge, not making full use of my right in the gospel.
>
> For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law--though not being myself under the law--that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law--not being without law toward God but under the law of Christ--that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. I do it all for the sake of the gospel, that I may share in its blessings. 1 Cor 9:18:23 RSV

Next Paul shows that Christians are engaged in no mock battle, no "soft" way of life, and that therefore they are to exert all their strength in order to be overcomers. He illustrates from the famous Grecian games with which both he and his listeners are familiar.

> Do you not know that in a race all the runners compete, but only one receives the prize? So run that you may obtain it. Every athlete exercises self-control in all things. They do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable. Well, I do not run aimlessly, I do not box as one beating the air; but I pommel my body and subdue it, lest after preaching to others I myself should be disqualified. 1 Cor 9:24-27 RSV

Additional illustrations of the need for spiritual exertion are drawn from the experiences of ancient Israel. Lest the Corinthians should conclude that the battle was too difficult and therefore despair, he adds the promise;

> God is faithful, and he will not let you be tempted beyond your strength, but with the temptation will also provide the way of escape, that you may be able to endure it. 1 Cor 10:13 RSV

In climaxing his appeal to the Corinthians on this issue of eating foods offered to idols, the Apostle repeats the guiding principles and then with strong common sense suggests appropriate modes of behaviour in this matter.

> "All things are lawful," but not all things are helpful. "All things are lawful," but not all things build up. Let no one seek his own good, but the good of his neighbor. Eat whatever is sold in the meat market without raising any question on the ground of conscience. For "the earth is the Lord's and everything in it." If one of the unbelievers invites you to dinner and you are disposed to go, eat whatever is set before you without raising any question on the ground of conscience. (But if some one says to you, "This has been offered in sacrifice," then out of consideration for the man who informed you, and for conscience' sake--I mean his conscience, not yours--do not eat it.) . . .
>
> So, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God. Give no offense to Jews or to Greeks or to the church of God, just as I try to please all men in everything I do, not seeking my own advantage, but that of many, that they may be saved. Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ.
> 1 Cor 10:23- 11:1. RSV

The counsel which he had given regarding the food offered to idols might have been objected to by some on the grounds that their liberty would thus be curtailed because of the uneducated consciences of a few. Now Paul shows that he had practiced what he now taught.

> Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are not you my workmanship in the Lord? If to others I am not an apostle, at least I am to you: for you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord.

> This is my defense to those who would examine me. Do we not have the right to our food and drink? Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a wife, as the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas? Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to refrain from working for a living? Who serves as a soldier at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard without eating any of the fruit? Who tends a flock without getting some of the milk?
>
> Do I say this on human authority? Does not the law say the same? For it is written in the law of Moses, "You shall not muzzle an ox when it is treading out the grain." Is it for oxen that God is concerned? Does he not speak entirely for our sake? It was written for our sake, because the plowman should plow in hope and the thresher thresh in hope of a share in the crop. If we have sown spiritual good among you, is it too much if we reap your material benefits? If others share this rightful claim upon you, do not we still more?
>
> Nevertheless, we have not made use of this right, but we endure anything rather than put an obstacle in the way of the gospel of Christ.

The next problem was concerning personal appearance while at church. The custom among the Jews and the Romans was to pray with heads covered, but the Greek custom was the reverse. As regards the attire of women there was also a difference. Many of the women in Corinthian church, on the grounds of the equality of the sexes in Christ, were worshipping without the usual head covering that was the customary acknowledgment of subjection to a husband. Paul, therefore, decides in favour of the local custom, that men should not have covered heads at worship but that the women should. He here asserts that Christians should never differ from custom unless on the grounds of principle. Women for example, were to accept their customary station despite their equality in Christ.

The Apostle proceeds to rebuke sternly the profaners of the Lord's Supper; and to aid them in reformation, he gives a simple narrative of the institution of that service and a solemn warning of the

dangers involved in sacrilege. He points out that self-examination should precede participation in the ordinance and adds: "if we judged ourselves truly, we should not be judged." Thus he indicates that reformation of manners will mean benefit--if they participate according to his directions, they are less likely to meet with condemnation in the Judgment.

To explain all that is involved in the subject of spiritual gifts, and especially the gift of tongues, with which Paul is next concerned would require a book in itself. Here we shall only sketch the situation and then point out the method adopted by Paul to straighten out the disorders and the fanaticism in this matter into which these early Christians had fallen. Christians believe that after Christ ascended, the Holy Spirit descended and with Him special spiritual gifts which were to aid in the task of the building up of the church. Among these gifts was the gift of tongues. Scholars differ as to whether these were actual languages or ecstatic utterances or both. At Corinth some believing themselves to have this gift had insisted on dominating assemblies by their extravagent use of the same. Confusion was the result. Paul aims to repair this situation by urging genuine spiritual humility which will prevent pseudo spiritual exhibitionism. He begins by pointing out that every believer in Christ has some spiritual gift and that this comes by divine grace and that therefore no one is to boast himself above another. He declares that the gifts which seem the least outstanding may actually be the most important and that, therefore, those who believed themselves to be the possessors of "major" gifts should walk in humility. He employs the analogy of the human body to represent the church composed of individuals of diverse talents.

> For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body--

> Jews or Greeks, slaves or free--and all were made to drink of one Spirit. . . .
>
> But God has so adjusted the body, giving the greater honor to the inferior part, that there may be no discord in the body, but that the members may have the same care for one another. If one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together. Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it.
>
> 1 Cor 12:12-27 RSV

We owe to this disorder in the Corinthian church one of the greatest gems of rhetoric--the thirteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, the paean to love. Few who quote it are aware of the context in which it is placed. Paul has just pointed out that all have special gifts. He has shown that some of these gifts are apparently superior and that these are not entrusted to every man. Now he adds: "I will show you a still more excellent way." He promises to point to a mode of conduct more excellent than the exhibiting of brilliant talents. Quite apart from its significance in terms of moral value, it is doubtful if any item of literature or oratory of similar length has such beauty or power. When we remember that it originated with the Apostle of faith and in an age when love's counterfeits abounded, this passage appears the more outstanding.

> By what mystery of genius or grace of divine plan did this naturally proud, self-assertive, intolerant man write the world's greatest ode to love? Love is a theme more written about than any other since the world began. The poets of all languages and all generations have sung its praises. Yet it was reserved for this persecuted Jew, with a mind trained in rabbinical subtleties, in a casual letter, written in haste to meet a pressing condition, to sing the song of love which surpasses anything in truth, in comprehensiveness, in beauty, composed by any poet of the ancient or modern world.[1]

---

[1]Charles Allen Dinsmore, The English Bible as Literature (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1931), p. 291.

So perfect a literary production is this 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians that many have refused to believe that Paul could have spontaneously dictated it in the writing of a casual letter. They have questioned the fact that this section actually belonged to the original epistle. However as pointed out in The Interpreter's Bible[1] ". . . on closer examination it is seen that almost every word in the chapter has been chosen with this particular situation at Corinth in mind." [V 10:165]. For example, the Apostle aims to correct the extravagant use of the gift of tongues or some counterfeit of it. He has introduced this subject in the preceding chapter and proposes to spend all the succeeding chapter on the same topic. In the interspersed psalm of love he purposely contrasts the glamour and duration of this gift with the true splendour and eternal nature of love. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal." "Charity never faileth . . . whether there be tongues, they shall cease. . . ." vs 1, 8. It is evident that the matrix of this pearl was the emergency at Corinth. Despite this, we have here a chapter which "for moral elevation, for richness and comprehensiveness, for beauty and felicity of expression, has been the admiration of the Church in all ages."[2]

---

[1]John Short, "Exposition of First Corinthians," The Interpreter's Bible: The Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for Each Book of the Bible. 12 Vols. Editorial Board: George Arthur Buttrick, commentary editor, and others (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-1957).

[2]Hodge, cited by Christian Friedrich Kling, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians," Johann Peter Lange et al. (eds.) A Commentary of the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students. Translated from the German and edited, with additions, by Philip Schaff et al. 25 Vols. (New York: C. Scribner and Sons Co., 1884-85), Vol. 21, p. 267.

It is important that we remember that the old English expression "charity" employed by the KJV is a poor rendering of the Greek agapē. This word does not occur in the writings of any of the pagans and seems to have been chosen purposely by Paul in contrast to the usual terms employed for love which currently carried connotations of sensual passion or at best the affection between close relatives.

> For it should not be forgotten that agapē is a word born within the bosom of revealed religion: it occurs in the Septuagint (2 Sam xiii:15; Cant ii:4: Jer ii:2) and in the Apocrypha (Wisdom iii:9); but there is not trace of it in any heathen writer whatever, and as little in Philo or Josephus; the utmost they attain to here is philanthropia and philadelphia, and the last never in any sense but as the love between brethren in blood. . . .[1]

The "love" of which Paul speaks embraces as its objects both God and man. It is in no sense synonymous with our modern understanding of "charity." Paul's very depreciation of almsgiving in v3 proves this.

> But what the Apostle here speaks of, is not any one particular virtue or grace, but that which is the root and spring of all virtues and graces, and which to possess is to be both like God and in God. . . . Paul here exhibits to us love after the manner of a jeweller handling the most precious gem of his cabinet, turning it on every side, shewing it in varied lights, and holding it up to view in a way best fitted to awaken desire for its possession.[2]

It is readily perceived that this ode has three divisions, namely the necessity of love, an analysis of love, the permanence of love. There is climax throughout as the Apostle first sets forth the worth of love negatively by contrast with other gifts, then it is set forth positively as it is passed through a verbal prism separating and throwing into full relief its shining rays, and finally contrast is again employed to

---

[1]Richard Chenevix Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (London: Macmillan and Co., 1880), pp. 43-44.

[2]Kling, Lange's Commentary, vol. 21, p. 267.

demonstrate that love will never fail but endure forever with a permanence transcending all else that we here know. Each phrase is wonderfully apposite, for the features selected as characteristic of love are mainly those in which the Corinthians had shown themselves defective.

When Paul asserts that "love envieth not," he employs a word zaloun which denotes the manifestation of unpleasant feelings in views of the advantages of others, causing schism and strife, the very ills to which the first part of this letter makes reference. Similarly when he points out that "love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up," doth not behave itself unseemly," we cannot help being reminded of the braggarts in the Corinthian church who professed "we all have knowledge" and who sought to find in every church service an opportunity for self-display. The ills of the church to which Paul makes these slanting allusions had grown out of the characteristics of the city in which it was located, and Corinth was notorious for its intellectual pride, and moral vanity.

Again when Paul declares that "love seeketh not her own," his assertion appropriately rebukes the spirit of litigation referred to earlier in chapter six when he had asked the questions "Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?" These Christian brethren who were taking one another to court could have had no more effective rebuke than this slight reference in the description of love.

Similarly when Paul shows that love transcends prophecy, knowledge, and the gift of tongues by virtue of its permanence, he unerringly selected for his contrast the gifts most esteemed by those to whom he wrote. Here we have further evidence of the unity of theme of 1 Corinthians. For example, concerning the knowledge and wisdom

mentioned in verses eight and nine, at the commencement of the letter he had concisely summarised distinctive Jewish and Greek characteristics by saying "For the Jews require a sign and the GREEKS SEEK AFTER WISDOM." Because Paul aims to disparage mere human wisdom and puny man's pride, he boldly declares to these Greeks that:

> . . . it is written I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will being to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. . . . God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise. . . . That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom . . . That, according, as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." 1:19-31

Again in chapter 2 we read:

> For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified . . . And my speech was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. . . .
> Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth . . . But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. 2:2, 4, 5, 13, 14.

In chapter 8 with some irony Paul declares further:

> Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth. And if any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know. But if any man love God, the same is known of him. vs 1, 2.

If these verses are compared with 1 Cor 13, the unity of thought is apparent. In the analysis of love the Apostle declared that love embraced humility; it was "not puffed up." Previously he had written as above that "knowledge puffeth up." In the same context as the latter

statement were the words "if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet. . . ." In the 13th chapter he says the same thing in another way. "For we know in part . . . For now we see through a glass, darkly . . . Thus the Apostle displays the pre-eminence of love by declaring that our boasted knowledge is partial. Even complete knowledge of a part is here impossible, for this cannot be until the full relation of the part to the whole is understood and this latter requires full knowledge of the whole itself which is now impossible.

The appositeness of the Apostle's analysis of love to the conditions in the Corinthian church has been pointed out, and also the unity of thought discernible between this chapter and the preceding ones as manifested by the allusions to knowledge. Thirdly it should be stated that this very emphasis on love is not here for the first time introduced, but rather here it appears climactically, crowning previous references to the same healing virtue. According to The Interpreter's Bible, "in almost every chapter love is elevated as the true mark of the new life."[1] A few references will make this apparent. In the third chapter, for example, Paul declares that the absence of love proves the Christian immaturity of the schismatics.

> For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?
> v. 3

Again in ch 8 v 1

> Knowledge puffeth up, but charity [agapē] edifieth.

And in the final chapter:

> Let all your things be done with charity. 16:14

---

[1]Clarence Tucker Craig, "Introduction to the First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 10, p. 10.

There is another reason why this chapter is remarkable for its cogency. It is likely that the Corinthians discerned that Paul was here drawing the portrait of a Person and not merely of a virtue. Throughout the letter he had appealed to their love for Christ and Christ's love for them as the supreme motive in holy living. When he rebuked them for their schisms, he had appealed by saying:

> Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing. . . . Is Christ divided? . . . . of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. 1:10, 13, 30

Likewise, Paul had declared that his one theme in preaching was Christ.

> For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ. 2:2

In the third chapter he asserts that there can be only one foundation for character building:

> For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. v 11

When Paul would urge the believers to forsake their vices, he adjures them

> Purge out therefore the old leaven . . . For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. 5:7

To incline the Corinthians towards a more loving attitude to each other Paul informs them that to sin against the brethren was to "sin against Christ." 8:12. Even the "weak brother" is one "for whom Christ died." v 11 They are assured that they are the very "body of Christ, and members in particular." 12:27

Thus does Paul motivate through the person of Christ throughout. Does he swerve from this pattern in the thirteenth chapter?

> This hymn in praise of love is of importance with regard to the question of St. Paul's personal knowledge of Jesus Christ. It is too often forgotten that Saul of Tarsus was a contemporary of our Lord, and the tendency of historical criticism at the present time is to place the date of Saul's conversion not very long after the Ascension. Furrer and Clemen would argue for this. Saul may not have been in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion and Resurrection; but he would have abundant means of getting evidence at first hand about both, after the Appearance on the road to Damascus had made it imperative that he should do so; and some have seen evidence of exact knowledge of the life and character of Jesus of Nazareth in this marvellous analysis of the nature and attributes of Love. We have only, it is said, to substitute Jesus for Love throughout the chapter, and St. Paul's panegyric "becomes a simple and perfect description of the historic Jesus" (The Fifth Gospel, p. 153). Intellect was worshipped in Greece, and power in Rome; but where did St. Paul learn the surpassing beauty of love? "It was the life of love which Jesus lived which made the psalm of love which Paul wrote possible" (ibid.).[1]

The Interpreter's Bible[2] takes a similar position by saying "It is natural to feel that some person must have sat for this portrait."

This one brief chapter has done more for mankind than the whole of pagan literature. It cannot be overemphasized that love was not a pagan virtue. The Apostle had even to coin a rare word to express his thought. The ancients prized wisdom and physical and mental prowess, but they knew almost nothing of the qualities embodied in Christian love. If this one ideal had been Paul's only contribution to men in this discourse, the latter would remain one of the most influential addresses ever delivered. This ideal has been responsible for the entire transformation of the cruel and barbaric ancient culture of the Roman world. Today it is acknowledged in theory at least that the pattern set forth in

---

[1]Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, edited by S. D. Driver et al. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950), p. 286.

[2]John Short, "Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 10, p. 167.

1 Corinthians 13 is the most ennobling concept by which all men and nations can shape their conduct.

One more of many possible facets should be pointed out. This is the delicate tact wherewith Paul refrained from writing "Though YOU speak with the tongues of men or of angels. . . " and "now YOU know in part. . ." He chose rather to use the first person here. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity I am become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

In the following chapter the subject of spiritual gifts is concluded. In chapter twelve Paul had used the human body as an illustration of the Christian church. In chapter thirteen he had shown that the principle which was to quicken and govern that body is the principle of love. In the present chapter the application of this principle is shown to be in the selective and judicious use of those spiritual gifts which are helpful to the entire church body.

Thus in the first part of the next exhortation Paul points out that prophesying or inspired preaching is better than the use of tongues both as regards the church members and unbelievers (Vs 1-25). He argues as follows:

> For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for no man understandeth him. . . But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort. He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the church.
>
> For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.
>
> . . . in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men. vs 2, 3, 8, 9, 19, 20.

In the next section Paul suggests regulations for the orderly exercise of these particular gifts in church gatherings. His primary argument here is that "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints." v 33. Thirdly, Paul admonishes the Corinthian women not to bring disgrace upon the church by apparently seeking to assert their equality in Christ by means of contradicting the men in the meeting. Finally he declares in an admirable summary: "Let all things be done decently and in order." v 40.

By means of this chapter the Apostle has argued that just as it is love which gives value to general character and conduct so it is love which directs in the proper use of spiritual gifts.

> Having treated of various social, moral, ecclesiastical, and liturgical questions, the Apostle now takes up a doctrinal one, which he has kept to the last because of its vital importance. The Epistle begins with the subject of Christ Crucified (1:13-2:5); it ends with that of Christ Risen (xv).[1]

Calvin made a suggestion in this connection which may throw light on Paul's ability as an artist in speech construction. He declares that Paul purposely sought to bring the Corinthians to a correct state of mind by means of his rebukes and exhortations before he discussed the momentous subject of the resurrection, the only part of the message dealing with doctrine, and that doctrine a keystone of the evangel preached by Paul.[2]

> The following is a précis of the argument of the fifteenth chapter.
>
> The substance of my preaching has been and is the historical fact of the Resurrection of Christ, which was predicted in Scripture, and is vouched for by competent witnesses, most of whom are still living. Among these are the other Apostles

---

[1]Robertson and Plummer, pp. 328-329.

[2]Ibid., p. 328.

and myself; and greatly as they differ from me in calling and work, we are absolutely agreed about this.

vs 1-11

How is it that, in the face of this Apostolic proclamation, some people go about and declare that a resurrection of dead people is impossible; thus making Apostolic preaching to be a lie, and your faith to be a delusion, and the condition of dead Christians to be quite hopeless, and the condition of living Christians to be pitiable in the extreme?

But they are quite wrong; for Christ has risen, and therefore resurrection is for us certain. For in this matter Christ is the first sheaf of a vast harvest; and when He has conquered all that opposes Him, including death itself, then, as the Son of God, He will yield up everything to His Father, and God will be supreme.

Baptism for the sake of the dead would lose all its meaning, and Christian self-sacrifice would lose most of its inspiration and comfort, if there were no resurrection and no future life.

vs 12-34

People ask how the body that dies and the body that is raised can be the same. Nature itself shows that there is no necessity for their being the same. The seed and the plant that rises from it are so far from being the same, that the one must die in order that the other may live. Even between bodies that are material there are endless possibilities of difference; and not all bodies are material. There may be immense differences, yet real relationship, between the body that dies and the body that is raised. Scripture confirms this.

The transformation of the material body that dies into a glorified body that will not die is not only possible, but necessary and certain; and hence the completeness of the victory over Death.

With this certainty before you, be steadfast, working in sure hope of eternal life.

vs 35-58 [1]

Thus the chapter has three major sections. (1) The Resurrection of Christ is the foundation of the Gospel, 1-11. (2) Christ's resurrection

---

[1]Robertson and Plummer, pp. 330, 343-344, 365-366.

is both the type and guarantee of the resurrection of all who believe in Him, 12-34. (3) Objections to the doctrine considered, 35-58.

In the first section Paul affirms that the Gospel is not a set of abstractions or a system of truths deduced by reason but rather it is a summary of historical events concerning Christ and their significance for all believers. He declares that the Old Testament had foretold the resurrection of the One who would atone for the sins of the world and that at the time of his writing there were nearly 500 believers still living who had witnessed the fulfillment of the ancient prophecy, and who had actually seen the risen Christ.

Secondly, Paul points out that but for these facts the faith of the Corinthians, and of all other Christians, was actually farcical. He argues from the starting point of the heresy he combats by saying:

> But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. . . . ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. vs 13, 14, 17-19.

This series of enthymemes leads to a set of negative conclusions, but the succeeding set are positive in character.

> But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. vs 20-23

In the third section of the chapter he moves from cause and effect arguments to ones derived from analogy. He draws analogies between the resurrected body and the new plant from a buried seed; the different nature of the spiritual resurrected body from the present physical body is analogous to the already apparent differences existing between earthly and heavenly bodies; and an analogy exists between

the first and second Adams, the second Adam being Christ as the Head of the new race.

The most magnificent passage to be found in that chapter is the peroration to this section found in verses 51-55.

> Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?

There is an interesting contrast to be noted in Paul's argument for eternal life and the customary arguments for immortality which existed in his day. He says nothing of the Platonic idea of an indestructible soul which consciously lives on beyond the death of the body. According to the Interpreter's Bible--

> Of one thing we may be sure, Paul did not believe that man was by nature immortal. Participation in the life of the age to come depended on God's act of raising the dead.[1]

The Greek attitude towards such a belief is indicated by the response of the Athenians to the Mars Hill sermon which had referred to the resurrection. "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter." Acts 17:32. This is evidence that Paul's arguments were not chosen merely with the purpose of currying favour through the adoption of popular views.

The fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians is the true conclusion to this message of the Apostle. That which follows is merely a number

---

[1]Craig, "Introduction to the First Epistle to the Corinthians" The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 10, p. 12.

of addendums comprising exhortations regarding subsidiary matters, and salutations and good wishes.

Analysis of Pathos

What shall we say concerning the pathetic appeal of this epistle? Here as with all Paul's messages, there is no instance of emotion being used for emotion's sake. Each appeal to the feelings grows naturally out of the significance of the logical arguments presented. When he would rebuke party spirit, he argues that the so-called leaders of the different parties had not been the founders of Christianity. He asks "Is Christ divided- was Paul crucified for you?" Certainly here is an appeal to the feelings, but it is an appeal that springs from the logic involved. 1 Corinthians 13 likewise appeals to the heart, but it is also a well-reasoned analytical presentation of a principle which Paul felt could solve the problems of the church he addressed. In the fifteenth chapter also many of the assertions have a strong pathetic appeal.

> If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. vs 17-19

> If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die. v 32

He verges on the poetic when in exultation he cries--

> So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? vs 54, 55

The emotional appeal in each of these verses naturally issues from the momentous significance of the theme with which he grapples; and

the conclusions he draws from reasoned argument. He is appealing to self-preservation as manifested by the inherent desire in most men's hearts for immortality.

What evidence is there that Paul particularly adapted his speech to the audience he had in mind? Can any evidence be found that indicates his skill in contriving to put his listeners in a frame of mind suitable for the receptions of his ideas?

When we read the first nine verses of the letter, we find nothing to indicate that this church is anything other than a model church. He addresses "the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus," and declares "I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; that in everything ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge. . . ." There is nothing of attack in his first words, but very much to remind the church of their privileges and of the Apostle's love and care towards them. When his rebuke commences, it is by means of the pricking of conscience rather than sledge hammer blows of reproof. With a series of questions he emphasizes the nature of the unity of the body of Christ. He appeals to his own conduct among them as an example that the objective of the gospel was to unify men in Christ, not to create in them the spirit of partisanship.

One of the schismatic groups had called itself after the name of Apollos, described as one who was wonderfully eloquent. To meet this, Paul declares that when he had presented the gospel to them, it had been in simplicity, without the customary flourishes of the professional orators of this age of the second sophistic.

> And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching

was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. 2:1-4[1]

Both aspects of Paul's introductory appeal to the Corinthians, the references to Christ's behaviour and of his own at the time of the conversion of the Corinthians were calculated to remind them of their most sacred memories. George Campbell once wrote that persuasion has its "marvellous efficacy in rousing the passions, and by some secret, sudden, and inexplicable association, awakening all the tenderest emotions of the heart."[2] Certainly Paul's references to the crucifixion of Christ and his initial proclamation of that event to the Corinthians were provocative of the tenderest emotions. When we discover that there is not one page of the record of this message that does not refer to Christ, it becomes apparent that the sacred name was intended to be the most powerfully motivating force that could be invoked.[3]

Thus when Paul desires to persuade them against honoring one leader above another, he does not content himself with pointing out that all were but instruments in God's hand, and that "neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." He must continue by saying:

---

[1]As will be noted in a later section, this passage has considerable ethical appeal.

[2]George Campbell, Philosophy of Rhetoric, cited by Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 375.

[3]It is recognized that motive appeals and appeals to emotions are not strictly synonymous. However, as Glen E. Mills has written: . . . motivation has an effective "core" of feeling tones, such as likes, dislikes, interests, preferences, and others. . . . when situations matter to us, we experience feelings; and when they matter a great deal, we have strong emotional reactions." Composing the Speech (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952), pp. 192-193.

In the present instance of Paul's references to Christ and to his own preaching concerning Christ both appeals to emotions and motive appeals are involved. The Apostle appeals to the emotions of love and gratitude, and invokes the motive of religious sentiment. As Mills has said, an apt motive appeal will often cause an emotional reaction.

> Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are your's; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's. 3:7, 21-23

Here is appeal to a whole gamut of emotions including gratitude, contentment, and joy. The motives touched upon number among them self-preservation, property, power, reputation, and the affections. Paul has asserted that all things and all people are for the ultimate benefit of the true Christian, that he shares the ownership of things material and spiritual, temporal and eternal, and that God loves him so much as to guarantee his present and his future. Even death will mean advantage for the believer. Where else can we find an example of so comprehensive pathetic appeal in such short compass?

In the following chapter we have examples of indignant reproof, irony, sarcasm, and satire. Each of these can prove a dangerous weapon unless handled with great skill. Often they offend rather than win. However, as Neander has said: "The conceit of a narrow-minded bigotry can best be attacked with irony and sarcasm." Coming so obviously from one who deeply loved them, this message aroused in the Corinthians the feelings of shame and repentance. We know from 2 Cor 7:8-12 that the Corinthians took no offense and that reformation was accomplished by the Apostle's rebuke.

Typical of his emotional but meaningful rebuke is the following passage:

> For who sees anything different in you? What have you that you did not receive? If then you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift?
>
> Already you are filled! Already you have become rich! Without us you have become kings! And would that you did reign, so that we might share the rule with you! For I think that God has exhibited us apostles as last of all, like men sentenced to death; because we have become a spectacle to the world, to angels and to men. We are fools for Christ's sake, but you are wise in

> Christ. We are weak, but you are strong. You are held in honor, but we in disrepute. To the present hour we hunger and thirst, we are ill-clad and buffeted and homeless, and we labor, working with our own hands. When reviled, we bless; when persecuted, we endure; when slandered, we try to conciliate; we have become, and are now, as the refuse of the world, the offscouring of all things.
>
> I do not write this to make you ashamed, but to admonish you as my beloved children. For though you have countless guides in Christ, you do not have many fathers. For I became your father in Christ Jesus through the gospel. I urge you, then, be imitators of me. 1 Cor. 4:7-16 RSV

Paul so vividly contrasts his position with that of the Corinthians that only those completely devoid of sensitivity would not have been struck with shame and self-reproach.

The strongest of motives appropriate to their case is applied to these early Christians by Paul. When in ch 5 he bids them to excommunicate those who persisted in immorality, it is in order "that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." When he warns them against litigation, it is with the reminder that one day "the saints shall judge the world" and that therefore surely small church differences should now be easily settled among them. "I speak to your shame," declares Paul. "Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?" In warning against licentiousness, he reminds them that the body of every believer "is the temple of the Holy Ghost." "Furthermore" says he, "ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." v 20

To impress his point that believers strong in faith are to be careful of wounding the weaker consciences of their brethren, the Apostle characterises each of the latter as a brother "for whom Christ died." And he adds, "But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ." 8:11, 12. To impress his

point he even indulges in strong hyperbole. "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." v 13.

Another instance of Paul's choice of emotive words is his reference to the famed national athletics of Greece. The city of Corinth was within a day's journey of the famous Mt. Olympus, where the Greek games were held, regularly uniting Greeks from all over the peninsula. Paul takes this into account when he likens the Christian life to the course of the Greek athlete competing in the Olympian races.

> Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air; but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway. 1 Cor 9:24-27

Here is colorful language, picturing in terms of familiar scenes the truths he desired to convey. As a skilled orator Paul is not content with proving. His design is to move as well as to convince, and to this end he employs such picturesque imagery as the different building materials mentioned in chapter 3, and such figures as this one of the Olympic runner.[1]

Other examples of emotional proof have been referred to in the tracing of the argument of the epistle. For example, it was pointed out that not until he had softened his hearers and prepared their hearts did Paul present the doctrine that was most upon his heart to convey, that of the resurrection. We have seen also that the ode to love was more than an analysis of a virtue, it contained skillfully appropriate references

---

[1]"The abundance of adjectives, the pictorial effect, and the appeal to imagery contribute in no small measure" to emotional value, according to Thonssen and Baird, p. 372.

to the behaviour of the Corinthians, and these are made in such a way as to seek to convict the consciences and win the hearts of his hearers.[1]

However, it should be pointed out that perhaps the strongest phase of pathetic appeal in this address is that which is wedded also to ethical appeal, namely the revelation of Paul's own love for those to whom he spoke. In 1 Corinthians 2:4 he described his attitude in the former message. "For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be grieved, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you." These tears were implied by the fervid exhortations of the Apostle, and possibly these were as much responsible for the success of the letter as the logical arguments employed. That the epistle was successful is proved by the reference in a later letter to the reception of the former.

> For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season. Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance; for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death. For behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea what revenge! In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter. 2 Cor 7:8-11

---

[1]Paul aimed at convicting the Corinthians of their error in magnifying those gifts involving public display (such as the gift of tongues) by his argument concerning the temporary nature of prophecy, tongues, and human knowledge (1 Cor 13:8-13). He endeavoured to win them to his own way of thinking by the striking description of the less-esteemed gift of love. This description is so evidently a portrayal also of the Incarnate Son of God that the emotions of reverence, gratitude, and affection were probably aroused in the auditors.

Here is a list of the emotions evoked by the address we have been studying. These included sorrow, indignation, fear, desire to reform, religious zeal, etc. This subsequent record of the results of the letter suggests that the Apostle skillfully adapted his message to the particular situation of the recipients, and that he effectively plucked the requisite strings of pathos.

Analysis of Ethos

When we turn our consideration to the ethical appeal to be found in 1 Corinthians, we discover that this also, as with the pathetic appeal, is interwoven with the whole message. It is not a thing apart from the logical arguments of the Apostle or from his emotional expressions. Evidences of Paul's competence, high character, and good will have already been discovered in the tracing of the expression of his ideas in this epistle. His arguments were appropriate, dignified and lofty, and lovingly set forth. Nevertheless some underlining is called for in the following paragraphs.

The arguments of ethos are not here confined to evidences implicit in the arguments and appeals of 1 Corinthians. Rather the Apostle refers the church back to the significance of his own behaviour when among them years before. He reminds them that at that time he appeared "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling." Then regarding his preaching, he alleges "my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." (1 Cor 2:3, 4). Concerning his conduct he says:

> For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law, to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them

> that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. 1 Cor 9:19-22

He further reminds them that although he had every right to claim their financial support, he had not done so.

> Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? . . . Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. But I have used none of these things: neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me. . . . 1 Cor 8:13-15

Because of such irreproachable behavior when among them, Paul feels justified in calling upon the believers to follow his example. Thus we read such verses as the following:

> For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every church. 1 Cor 4:17

> Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ. 1 Cor 11:1

> Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. 1 Cor 14:19

These statements, when linked with the evidence afforded by his emphasis on the virtues of faith, hope and love, indicate the high character of the Apostle. Frequently the revelation is made by remarks which seem almost asides. For example, he is quite ready to declare that he, the planter of the church, is nothing, while God is everything (3:7). Also he is not reluctant to include himself as among those who "belong" to the Corinthians for their benefit. He affirms that he is not aware of misconduct on his part, but nevertheless only the Judgment day will fully reveal his heart (4:3).

The description in ch 4:9-15 is particularly strong in the elements of ethical appeal. He pictures himself and his fellow workers as "appointed to death," "Fools for Christ's sake," "despised," and "made

a spectacle unto the world. . . ."

> Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and labour, working with our own hands; being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it: being defamed, we intreat: we are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day.

This is a picture painted with broad deft strokes that has few equals in literature or oratory for its delineation of a sublime spirit.

Despite his humility, Paul does assert his competence by his claims as Christ's Apostle. This claim appears in the first sentence of 1 Corinthians. Again in 9:1-5 he urges the same claim in answer to his critics. In 4:15 he suggests that his authority should be apparent to the Corinthians inasmuch as he it was who brought them the gospel.

> For though ye have ten thousand instructers in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.

Such passages as 3:6 and 9:2 express the same thought. The latter is particularly forthright. "If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." In discussing the Lord' Supper, he claims that he received from Christ Himself the account of the institution, (11:23). Similarly in arguing for the resurrection, Paul asserts that he also beheld the risen Lord, referring to his experience on the Damascus road (15:8). When giving counsel concerning marriage, he affirms on four occasions that his advice is prompted by the Spirit of God (7:10, 12, 25, 40). 2 Cor. 2:4 indicates how goodwill for the Corinthians permeated his entire message to them.

> For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be grieved, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you.

Every chapter expresses in some way or other the spirit reflected in his closing words of this letter. "My love be with you all in Christ Jesus."

This love is identical with that described in the 13th chapter, and the Corinthians possessed in the earnest warnings of their spiritual father the evidence in him of a "love which suffered long and was kind, which envied not, vaunted not itself and was not puffed up, sought not her own, was not easily provoked, and hoped all things."

Analysis of Arrangement

We would now ask the following questions concerning 1 Corinthians. Do the various parts of this address combine to make an orderly and balanced whole? Is the plan of arrangement particularly accommodated to the audience situation? Can the emergence of a central theme be traced?

It has been impossible to analyze the ideas in this epistle without trespassing somewhat upon these other matters of arrangement. For example, the last question above was answered when the theme of 1 Corinthians 13 was shown to be the basic one of the epistle. Paul's great aim in dealing with the practical moral disorders of this church was to instruct them to apply comprehensive principles to solve every question of conduct. Rather than entrusting to them a multitude of rules regarding minutia of duty, he had emphasized such absolute principles as (1) Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. 1 Cor 10:31, and (2) Let all things be done with love. 1 Cor 16:14. The key word of the address is 'love' which appears twelve times, and which is translated "charity" in the KJV. Even the doctrinal message of the resurrection aims at the same target as the Apostle's insistence upon love. The fifteenth chapter concludes its closely reasoned argument with this exhortation: "Therefore my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain the Lord." 1 Cor 15:58. Thus in both the

practical and doctrinal sections Paul strives to motivate them to holy living. There is obviously present here the unity of theme and purpose which characterizes almost all great speeches, and which is essential for adequate arrangement.

As we consider the plan of arrangement, it must be kept in mind that the Apostle did not have entirely a free hand in choosing the subjects of his discourse. The church itself had provided many of these for him by their several questions in their letter to him. There are six major divisions in this epistle, and the problem-solution method is the mode of disposition.

(1) The introduction with its customary salutation accompanied by an expression of thanksgiving and hope. 1:1-9

(2) Urgent issues demanding immediate resolution. 1:10- 6:20 This section deals with the current schisms, immorality, and litigation.

(3) Replies to the enquiries of the church regarding marriage and food offered to idols. 7:1- 11:1.

(4) The Disorders associated with public worship. 1:2-14:40 In this section is discussed the disorderly behaviour of some Corinthian women during divine service, the laxity of conduct in connection with the Lord's Supper, and the misuse of spiritual gifts such as Tongues.

(5) Doctrinal section dealing with the resurrection of the dead. 15:1-58

(6) Final admonitions, counsel, and farewell. 16:1-24.

The Plan of the Epistle is very clear. One is seldom in doubt as to where a section begins and ends, or as to what the subject is. There are occasional digressions, or what seem to be such, as the statement of the great Principle of Forbearance (ix:1-27), or the Hymn in praise of Love (xiii), but their connexion with the main argument of the section in which they occur is easily seen.[1]

---

[1]Robertson and Plummer, xxiv.

A cursory review of the contents of the epistle will make its sequence apparent. In the introductory nine verses Paul praises the church for what progress it had made in the new life, and expresses the hope that this progress will continue till the end. Then he states positively what should be their condition of unity. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." v 10. This one verse summarizes beforehand what is to be the theme of the next four chapters.

He proceeds to recount that he has heard from visitors to Ephesus of the party spirit and divisions now agitating the church. He points out that this failure has grown out of an inordinate estimate of mere human wisdom, learning, and eloquence, an estimate entirely inconsistent with the plan of salvation, and the instruments and methods God had designed to promulgate the gospel. Only the truly spiritual can discern the true wisdom, and it is apparent that many of the Corinthians are yet carnal rather than spiritual.

Next Paul proceeds to point out that church leaders are mere channels through which God manifests blessing, and that they are not to be exalted one above another. Furthermore, any one who practices partisanship thereby does damage to the church of God which is the Temple of His Holy Spirit. In chapter 4 the Apostle paints the contrast between the self-sufficient spirit of the Corinthians, and the true condition of the Apostles. He reminds them that he is their spiritual father and that it is to him they should look for counsel and guidance.

Some of this counsel he proceeds to give. The church member guilty of gross immorality is to be excommunicated and the practice of litigation must cease. It is better to suffer wrong than to disgrace

Christianity before heathen tribunals. Christians are to be entirely separate from the pagans. Particularly in the matter of sexual morality will the difference be easily discerned, for the Christian will regard his body as the purchased possession of Christ and as the Temple for His Spirit.

The latter admonition was a fitting introduction for a study of the problems associated with marriage and divorce. He proceeds to answer their questions either by using the commands of Christ or his own advice, which the Apostle feels originates with the Divine Spirit.

In chapters eight to ten the attitude of the liberal-minded towards scrupulous believers in matters indifferent is discussed. While Paul agrees that food offered to idols is not inherently bad, he urges the liberals to respect the scruples of those with weak consciences and if necessary forego some of their own rights. As an example of this he points out that he himself had practised this attitude when he refrained from accepting material support from the believers, although he had every right to such support. Rather than give occasion for some to think that perhaps the motives of their evangelist were questionable he had paid his own way in all things. In summary, says Paul, "whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 10:31

This principle is now applied to church behavior. Women are warned not to presume upon their equality in Christ but to be subject to custom. The true mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper is pointed out, with emphasis upon the need for a loving attitude between the participants.

Some had boastfully exhibited what they claimed to be their particular spiritual gift, and the Apostle now in the twelfth chapter reviews the purpose of the gifts. These were intended for the edification of all the believers and not for the glorification of any single member. Love is to guide all in the exercise of their talents and each is to remember that

conduct controlled by love is "a more excellent way" of service than the manifestation of marvellous powers. The principle of love suggests certain rules for regulating the use of spiritual gifts in worship services.

Thus far Paul has dealt with defects in conduct. Now he turns to a defect in doctrinal knowledge. Some had arisen declaring there was to be no resurrection of the dead. But, says Paul, the very heart of the gospel is the resurrection of Christ and this event was the guarantee and type of the resurrection of all believers. Otherwise, Christian faith is vain, and strivings after righteousness are wasted effort, and furthermore the departed dead are lost for ever. Paul continues by discussing objections to the doctrine and soars into his sublime peroration--O Death,where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory? His main task accomplished, he descends to the discussion of a few details concerning future church plans, urges them again to let all their conduct be governed by love, and bids them an affectionate farewell.

Having reviewed the disposition of this particular discourse it should be stated that not all of Paul's messages are as orderly as this one. The next discourse, 2 Corinthians, has no such obvious plan and for a valid reason. Possibly this present letter is the best example of arrangement among the seven discourses to be studied in this dissertation.

Style

While the discussion of Paul's style is mainly reserved for a special chapter we would include here one apt quotation regarding the style manifested in this address.

> This Epistle ranks perhaps the foremost of all as to sublimity and earnest impassioned eloquence. Of the former, the description of the simplicity of the Gospel in ch ii.--the concluding apostrophe of ch. iii. from vers. 16 to the end--the same in ch vi. from ver. 9 to the end--the reminiscence of the shortness of the time ch vii. 29-31--the whole argument in ch. xv. are examples unsurpassed

> in Scripture itself; and of the latter ch. 8-15, and the whole of ch. ix., while the panegyric of love in ch. xiii. stands a pure and perfect gem, perhaps the noblest assemblage of thoughts in beautiful language extant in this world. About the whole Epistle there is a character of lofty and sustained solemnity, an absence of tortuousness of construction, and an apologetic plainness. . . .[1]

Results

The immediate results of 1 Corinthians are pictured for us in the following letter, and they are commented upon in our analysis of 2 Corinthians. At this juncture it may suffice to say that the church at Corinth, upon hearing the message from Paul, sought energetically to establish lasting reforms.

IV. THE SECOND DISCOURSE TO THE CORINTHIANS

> In no other Epistle do we obtain such an insight into the character, the inner life, the workings of the Apostle's mind and heart.[2]
>
> Of all the Epistles this is the one which teaches us most of the Apostle's personality. It enables us, as it were, to lay our hands upon his breast, and feel the very throbbings of his heart. If you would know St. Paul as he was, you must study the Epistle again and yet again.[3]
>
> We have nowhere else so clear an insight into the character and life of an apostle. . . We are especially here shown the high moral and religious spirit of the Apostle, his self-sacrificing devotion to

---

[1]Alford, cited by Lange's Commentary, Vol. 21, p. 15.

[2]Henry E. Jacobs et al., Annotations on the Epistles of Paul to I Corinthians VII-XVI, II Corinthians and Galatians. Vol. VIII of The Lutheran Commentary, edited by Henry E. Jacobs, 12 vols. (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1897), p. 159.

[3]Farrar, Messages, p. 232.

> the welfare of his converts, and the honorable principles which governed his conduct towards his fellow-laborers.[1]
>
> Here, in self-defence, he opens the most secret recesses of his heart. We see his keen logic, his nervous excitement, his deep indignation, his constant self-denial, his strong sense of independence, his immeasurable love. We see his sympathy with the strong combined with his tenderness for the weak; his fire and passion; his practical good sense and tact; his religious fervour; his immense devotion to the cause of Christ in which he was ready to spend and to be spent.[2]

These sample statements from scholars witness to the uniqueness of the letter we are about to discuss. It is Paul's own Apology for his life and conduct, and as such it provides the student of rhetoric with the rare opportunity of seeing an orator's heart and mind, probed as with a scalpel. Possibly there exist nowhere else in the realms of literature or oratory, self-revelatory passages equal to those found in 2 Corinthians. Even such works as The Confessions of St. Augustine are transcended by this spontaneous discourse, wherein the unveiling is ever prompted by devotion to an all-absorbing cause. Paul vindicates himself only in order that the Gospel of Christ might be rightly esteemed.

Even a cursory reading of this message from Paul demonstrates that this second address to the Corinthian church is richer in ethical proof than any other recorded discourse of the Apostle's. It should be kept in mind, however, that 2 Corinthians is significant to the rhetorician not only because of its emphasis upon ethos, but because this universal emphasis in Paul's messages finds here its chief exemplification. As the last chapter of this dissertation will emphasize, ethical argument and appeal is the distinguishing characteristic of Pauline oratory. Even the smallest of the Apostle's letters, the single page to Philemon, bears this indelible stamp, as will be pointed out in detail in another chapter.

---

[1]Kling, Lange's Commentary, vol. 21, p. 5.

[2]Farrar, Messages, p. 242.

The Occasion

The city and the church of Corinth have already been described in the introduction to the analysis of 1 Corinthians. Here we must inquire--What had taken place in the interlude between the despatching of the two letters? What occasioned Paul to send this second message so soon after his first? Why did he consider it necessary to enter upon such a vehement defense of his own character and conduct?

From allusions in this second letter, and from the record in the book of Acts, the background story can be reconstructed. It is vital that we should do so because as one writer has pointed out:

> In order to understand the Epistle we must throw ourselves, as by a mental effort, into the mind and heart of the writer at the moment when he wrote or, more probably dictated it.[1]

In Acts chapter 19 is described the anti-Christian riot which took place at Ephesus where Paul was preaching daily. It is probably to this event that he refers when he declares to the Corinthians:

> For we would not, brethren have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life: but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us. . . 2 Cor 1:8-10

> We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, . . . So then death worketh in us, . . . 2 Cor 4:8-12

---

[1]E. H. Plumptre, "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians," Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible, 8 vols (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959), Vol. VII, p. 359.

Scholars have suggested that certain of the Greek terms found in these passages indicate that the Apostle was still suffering from severe bodily injuries probably received during the riot at Ephesus. The word apokrima used in the phrase "sentence of death" is related to a cognate term which Hippocrates had frequently applied to morbid or virulent secretions.[1] Again it should be noted that the Greek word translated "dying" ("always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus" 4:10) literally means "the state of a corpse." Where Paul speaks of his being "cast down" he employs a military term which frequently was applied to one incapacitated by a dart or javelin.

The record in Acts declares that Paul was rescued from threatened death through the devotion of Aquila, Priscilla, and others who were prepared to risk their own lives in his behalf. He left Ephesus for Troas, and commenced his work anew. Apparently his preaching in Troas gained for him many converts, for concerning that experience he declared: "I came to Troas to preach Christ's gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the Lord. . ." 2 Cor 2:12. Nevertheless, the Apostle did not tarry long in this sphere of labour. He adds to the previous statement the words: "I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother: but taking my leave of them, I went from thence into Macedonia." v 13. Apparently Titus had been despatched to Corinth to ascertain what had been the reaction of the church to Paul's first letter. He was then to have returned to Troas to meet Paul. Aware that some new eventuality must have hindered Titus's early return, the Apostle to the Gentiles journeyed to Macedonia. Philippi was his most likely destination in that region, because there he had been instrumental in raising up the first Christian church in Europe. While we have no record of the event, it seems probable that it was here that Paul was reunited with his fellow-labourer.

Judging from the outburst of thanksgiving at the beginning of this letter, the news of Titus was mainly favourable. The first letter had done its intended work, and most of the Corinthian believers accepted Paul's rebukes as merited by them. In his second letter, the Apostle describes his receipt of the good news.

> For when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears. Nevertheless God, that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus; and not by his coming only, but by the consolation wherewith he was comforted in you, when he told us your earnest desire, your mourning, your fervent mind toward me; so that I rejoiced the more. For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season. Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death. . . . I rejoice therefore that I have confidence in you in all things. 2 Cor 7:5-16

But Titus brought with him other news which was not as acceptable. A minority party in the church not only refused to repent, but they attempted to tear in shreds the character and reputation of Paul. With fanatical zeal they criticised the teachings of the Apostle and denied his right to be called an Apostle of Christ. Judging from 2 Cor 11:22, this was a Jewish faction striving to place its own mold upon Corinthian Christianity.

In this eventuality we have the chief cause of the distinctive nature of 2 Corinthians. Without the stimulus of this bitter criticism, Paul is hardly likely to have poured out his soul as here recorded. His attempted refutation of the calumnies enters into the warp and woof of this letter. So much is this the case, that it is possible to glean from the text approximately twenty specific accusations made by the enemies of Paul. These

can be categorised as attacks on, (1) his person, (2) his teaching, (3) his character. Regarding his person they asserted that it was "base" (ch 10:1), "weak" (ch 10:10), and his speech "contemptible." (ch 10:10). Regarding his teaching, his critics declared that he was no true Apostle, and therefore did not dare to claim financial support from the believers (1 Cor 9:1-23; 2 Cor 11:7-12; 12:13). Neither the Christ he described, nor the gospel he offered, was genuine (ch 11:4). He perverted the Word of God (2:17; 4:2). Furthermore, he exalted self rather than Christ (4:5).

As to Paul's character, his detractors affirmed that he had no letters of reference to commend him (ch 3:1). He was inconstant, for he had failed to fulfill his announced plan of itinerary, which had promised the Corinthians a pastoral visit (1:15-17). He was afraid to face those who now painted him in his true colors (13:3; 10:9-11; 12:20, 21). The collection Paul was gathering was possibly only a means of filling his own pockets (12:16-19; 8:20-23). Finally, the sanity of this so-called "Apostle" was to be doubted, and his supposed "visions" were mere fancies (5:13; 11:16-19; 12:6; 12:2; 5:16).[1]

The following words of the commentator Plumptre aptly suggest the likely effect upon Paul of such criticisms as outlined above.

> Conceive all these barbed arrows of sarcasm falling on the ears, and through them piercing the very soul, of a man of singularly sensitive nature, passionately craving for affection, and proportionately feeling the bitterness of loving with no adequate return (ch 12:15), and we may form some estimate of the whirl and storm of emotion in which St. Paul began to dictate the Epistle on which we are about to enter. Joy, affection, tenderness, fiery indignation, self-vindication, profound thoughts as to the mysteries of the kingdom of God which flashed upon his soul as he spoke--all these elements were there, craving to find expression. They hindered any formal plan and method in the structure of the

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, pp. 244-245.

Epistle. They led to episodes, and side-glances, and allusive references without number.[1]

Analysis of the Development of Ideas, with Emphasis Upon Logos

With our primary interest now focused upon the evaluation of logical content, our objective will be to determine how fully a given speech enforces an idea; how closely that enforcement conforms to the general rules of argumentative development; and how nearly the totality of the reasoning approaches a measure of truth adequate for purposes of action.[2]

. . . according to the Dewey formula, the speaker's logical capacities are estimated in the light of (1) his recognition of the problem which, at the moment, is disturbing or is about to disturb the status quo; (2) his analysis of the nature and bearing of the problem upon the social setting; (3) his fertility of mind in suggesting ideas relevant to the solution of the difficulty; (4) his acuteness in examining, through reasoning, the implications of his suggestions; and (5) the verification of his judgment following the acceptance of the most feasible solution.[3]

The above quotations suggest canons whereby to test the quality of Paul's ideas as expressed in 2 Corinthians. However, because the particular problem under consideration is the reverse of being abstract or impersonal, we shall look not only for the elements described above, but also for considerable warmth of expression. Entire objectivity here, on Paul's part, would not only be impossible; it would be ridiculous. To approach this kind of problem without some warmth of feeling would be to cast a doubt upon the defense. The Corinthians were very far from being modern sophisticates absorbed in scientific method. Therefore, we have no right to anticipate that Paul's arguments will be those of a scrupulous logician. Instead we could expect that his most

---

[1]Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 360.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, p. 334.

[3]Ibid., p. 336.

appropriate logic in this case would be the logic of demonstration through self revelation rather than that achieved through links in a chain of reasoning. That which would probably carry most weight with the individuals he had won to Christ would be a demonstration of his own sincerity, as far as this was possible in a written message. With these considerations in mind let us enquire--What content of ideas is to be found in this epistle? How does the Apostle argue his case? What are his underlying assumptions?

The basic premise of the Apostle's entire argument is suggested at the very commencement. His enemies had suggested that one as weak, despised, and persecuted as the Apostle, could not be an authorized ambassador of the great God. Paul responds by declaring that all of God's true servants are disciplined by trials and sufferings. He asserts that the sufferings of Christ are to be shared by all true believers, and that these are a moral discipline designed to lead to the faith and trust in Divine Providence required of all Christians. Paul adds to this argument by declaring that suffering safeguards the messengers of the Most High from the peril of pride, and demonstrates to them that all their strength comes from God alone. Thus also the flock is taught that the success of the gospel is due to divine, and not human, power. Let us notice Paul's use of this fundamental argument. Immediately after the salutation, he breaks out in praise:

> Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God. For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ. And whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation, which is effectual in the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer: . . . And our hope of you is stedfast, knowing, that as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so shall ye be also of the consolation. For we

> would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life: but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver; in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us. . . 1:3-10

This introductory passage is the keynote of the epistle, and summarises the argument of the whole. Therefore, it should be closely examined in order that subsequent passages, based upon the thoughts in this one, may be readily understood.

First, we notice that the words "suffering," "tribulation," or their equivalents are used by the Apostle more than ten times in these eight verses. Secondly, Paul implies in v 5 that there is a mystical parallel between the sufferings of Christ and the troubled career of believers. Thirdly, it is affirmed that such tribulation brings a spiritual maturity whereby one is able to assist others in trouble (v 4), because of one's own experience of the consolations from God. Fourthly, all such tribulations lead to ultimate benefit (vs 6, 7). Fifthly, not the least of such benefits is the development of implicit trust in divine power (v 9).

That these assumptions underlie the argument of the epistle is discernible by noticing their recurrence throughout. A glance at subsequent verses which use the words "tribulation" or "affliction" also indicates this. For example, in the second chapter and the fourth verse Paul declares: "For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you." In the fourth chapter we have as follows: "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us. We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying

of the Lord Jesus ... . For we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." vs 7-11. Later in the same chapter, this thought recurs. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. . . ." vs 17, 18. In the sixth chapter, the thread of this thought is again apparent in the fourth verse. "But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses. . . ." Notice that Paul directly says here that these very difficulties are requisite for making manifest who are the genuine ministers of God. In a similar position in the next chapter we read: "I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulation." v 4. Again, in the eighth chapter Paul states: "For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened." v 13. The word here translated "burdened" is elsewhere in this letter translated as "afflicted" or "troubled," and should be so in this case.

This refrain concerning tribulation as the lot of the human instruments of God reaches a crescendo in the eleventh and twelfth chapters. Referring to his critics at Corinth Paul asks: "Are they ministers of Christ? . . . I am more. . . ." Then he proceeds to chronicle a portion of his missionary experience.

> . . . in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Beside those things that

> are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches. vs 23-28

We shall not at this juncture pause to comment upon the ethical appeal of this recital. It is sufficient for now that we observe its conformity to the premise expressed at the commencement of the discourse, namely that all the true servants of God are disciplined by trials and sufferings. Similarly, in the next chapter we read:

> And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure. For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong. 12:7-10

These two passages constitute the peak of the Apostle's argument. Over and over he has repeated the thought that suffering is a seal of genuine apostleship, if associated with evidences of the power of God. In the beginning and end of his address he has demonstrated that such has been his own lot. In the body of the message, again and again he has interwoven the same evidence derived from personal experience. As we recall that the Corinthian believers centered their faith around a Divine Person whose life of sorrows had been climaxed by the sufferings of Calvary, it is evident that Paul's argument was both powerful and appropriate.

The tracing of a second key-word in the epistle reveals a second line of argument. This word is <u>phaneroō</u>, which means "to manifest," "to make clear." This word or its cognates occurs almost as many times as there are chapters in the letter. Apparently the opposition party at Corinth had accused Paul of falsifying the Scriptures, and

teaching a mysterious, hidden doctrine. Furthermore, they urged that he gained converts through deceitful methods (4:3; 2:17; 4:2). In 2 Cor 12:16 the Authorized version represents Paul as saying: ". . . nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile." Most modern versions correct this rendering, and in harmony with what is admissible from the original Greek, translate it as Paul's reference to the charge of his opponents at Corinth. The RSV has "I was crafty, you say, and got the better of you by guile." The many passages wherein Paul uses the word phaneroō refer to these slanders and are intended as rebuttal. Let us consider some of these passages.

> Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us. We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed. . . . 4:1-8

We have noticed from 2 Cor 12:16, and other passages, that Paul had been accused of craftiness. This present passage is Paul's preliminary attempt at vindicating his behaviour. What is first noteworthy is the skillful employment of varying terms which signify the opposite of all that is associated with craftiness. For example, while craftiness is usually linked with surreptitious, hidden activities, which are performed in the dark for fear of witnesses, Paul's behaviour is here associated with frank manifestations of truth witnessed by both men and God. ". . . by

manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." v 2 Phaneroō, the root word for "manifestation" means "to make clear," "to bring into the light," and it can hardly be accidental that Paul pursues this thought by the repeated references to "light," "glory," "shining" in this passage. The word "light" occurs three times, "glory" or a cognate occurs twice, and "shining" is referred to on three occasions. The Apostle here argues from sign and from analogy. One sign of his upright behaviour had been the fact that the only means he had employed to win his way among the Corinthians had been "the manifestation of truth." He had not appealed to men's prejudices or tastes, but instead he had presented that which was highest and which their own consciences had acknowledged. By declaring in verse three that only "the lost" had found his gospel "hidden" or hard to understand, Paul reminds the Corinthians that they had understood the message. Surely, he infers, this demonstrates that my words were not clouded with the shadows of error or deceit. In verse five he mentions another sign of the correctness of his behaviour among them. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus's sake." None could say he had been egotistic in his preaching. He had not preached himself. Christ had been his theme. Furthermore his sole presentation of himself had been as one who was prepared to be "a servant for Jesus' sake." The word used for "servant" is doulos, which literally means "slave."

Next Paul employs an analogy from the record of the creation found in the first chapter of Scripture. He refers to the time when God caused the light to shine out of darkness, and he uses this as a parallel to the work that God has evidently done through him, by his manifestation of the gospel of light to those in the heathen darkness of Corinth. Thus he

reminds the church that their own experience of conversion is the strongest evidence that he, Paul, had been an agent of God. The charge made by the Jewish faction that the Apostle had practised deceit must be false, or the experience of the majority of the church members had been a delusion. Verse four had made reference to a fact that the Corinthians already acknowledged, namely that it was Satan, "the god of this world" who brought darkness upon men. This being the case, the believers must either acknowledge Paul to be what he claimed to be, or they must repudiate their own recent experience of conversion.

In the seventh verse Paul had referred to himself as an "earthen vessel." Probably this is a side glance at the taunts from his opponents regarding his physique and his infirmities. The mockery is turned to good account as Paul argues that God is glorified the more by His employment of weak instruments. The thought is naturally extended by the following reference to his current persecutions and difficulties. We should observe that Paul thus intertwines his primary argument (regarding suffering as a badge of discipleship), with his present claim of transparently sincere and holy conduct.

In this one short passage of eight verses Paul has denied the charge of his having employed guile. Summarising the foregoing, we find that his arguments are as follows:

1. He had ever lived openly as both the Corinthians and God had witnessed.
2. His method of working had been the manifestation of such truths as the consciences of his hearers had acknowledged.
3. His preaching had been marked by humility. Only Christ had been exalted. The Apostle had dedicated himself to service, as though a slave, in order to help the Corinthians.

4. As certainly as God made the light in the beginning, so it must have been He who used Paul as an instrument of light to rescue the Corinthians from the darkness of their former errors.
5. Paul's bodily infirmities were no cause for his rejection, inasmuch as it glorified God to use weak vessels.
6. Similarly the troubles and conflicts endured by the Apostle witnessed to the fact that he had been chosen to share "the sufferings of Christ."

His detractors had painted the picture of a weak, crafty deceiver suffering for his sins. Paul reverses their use of "light and shade" and causes his true likeness to appear.

In the next chapter the same figure of "manifestation" is used in a new argument from the Apostle.

> Wherefore we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences. 5:9-11

Here Paul asserts that in all his labours, the thought of the Judgment Day, as well as the love of Christ (v 14) motivated his behaviour. The English translation obscures the fact that Paul uses the same word here for "appear" as is elsewhere translated "manifest."

> It may be noted that it [phaneroō] is specially characteristic of this Epistle, in which it occurs nine times. The English version, which can only be ascribed to the unintelligent desire of the translators to vary for the sake of variation, besides being weak in itself, hinders the reader from seeing the reference to 1 Cor 4:5, or even the connection with the "made manifest" in the next verse.[1]

---

[1]Plumptre, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 379.

Paul is saying in effect--Inasmuch as all that I do must one day be manifested at the Judgment bar of God, I daily live in such a way that both God and man may behold in me irreproachable conduct. His argument also implies that it is hardly likely that he who had preached concerning the Judgment to the Corinthians, would live as though in ignorance of that ultimate denouement. Phaneroō recurs in later chapters of the letter (7:12; 11:6), emphasizing and repeating the thoughts earlier expressed.

Having now considered the two fundamental concepts of this letter, relative to Paul's sufferings and his transparent conduct, let us now turn to the subsidiary arguments which are interwoven with the foregoing in the Apostle's Apology.

Following his enunciation,in chapter one, of the significance of suffering for the Christian and the record in chapter two of his receipt of good news from Titus, Paul turns to consider the accusation that he had no letters of reference to commend him. His argument in this third chapter is not an easy one for a modern western mind to comprehend, and therefore the whole text is presented in order that its force upon the minds of the early Christians might be explained.

> Are we beginning to commend ourselves again? Or do we need, as some do, letters of recommendation to you, or from you? You yourselves are our letter of recommendation, written on your hearts, to be known and read by all men; and you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.
>
> Such is the confidence that we have through Christ toward God. Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life.
>
> Now if the dispensation of death, carved in letters on stone, came with such splendor that the Israelites could not look at

> Moses' face because of its brightness, fading as this was, why should not the dispensation of the Spirit be attended with greater splendor? For if there was splendor in the dispensation of condemnation, the dispensation of righteousness must far exceed it in splendor. Indeed, in this case, what once had splendor has come to have no splendor at all, because of the splendor that surpasses it. For if what faded away came with splendor, what is permanent must have much more splendor.
>
> Since we have such a hope, we are very bold, not like Moses, who put a veil over his face so that the Israelites might not see the end of the fading splendor. But their minds were hardened; for to this day, when they read the old covenant, that same veil remains unlifted, because only through Christ is it taken away. Yes, to this day whenever Moses is read a veil lies over their minds; but when a man turns to the Lord the veil is removed. Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit. 3:1-18 RSV

Basically, this is an argument from analogy. It includes the use of metaphor, synecdoche, simile, and symbolism.

The first verse declares his purpose in this section of his discourse. ". . . need we, as some others, epistles of commendation to you, or letters of commendation from you?" Immediately prior to these words he had uttered a burst of praise to God because of the divine blessing on his ministry (2:4-16). This could be ridiculed by his critics who might be led to assert that "self-praise is no recommendation." Therefore Paul sets about to establish that his position as an Apostle does not rest upon his own claims merely, or upon letters of reference from other sources. It was a common practice in the early church to use letters of recommendation for Christians leaving one community for another. The letter to Philemon in the New Testament is of this nature. Possibly Paul's critics at Corinth were themselves in possession of such from some church leaders at Jerusalem. This would explain Paul's allusion in verse one to "the some" who were

vaunting such epistolatory recommendations. In this same verse the Apostle is ironically, but also sadly, enquiring whether he, the founder of the Corinthian church, stood in the same position of need as regards references as did utter strangers.

In answer to his own question he asserts in bold metaphor "Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men: forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God: not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." vs 2, 3. The metaphor regarding the living epistle as existing both in the hearts of Paul and his fellow labourers, and in the person of his converts, may at first seem clumsy in application. Only Paul's habit of compressing several ideas within very brief compass guides us in understanding his meaning here. Firstly his meaning is that the Corinthians themselves are written as a letter on the Apostle's heart. The affectionate ties between the church members and their leader gave visible evidence to all men of his true relationship to the church. His pre-occupation with their welfare, his intercession on their behalf, his many tears shed regarding them--all these witnessed to his real character and standing. Secondly, Paul is saying that the Corinthians themselves, in their changed conduct since conversion, constituted a living recommendation of him who had been the human instrument of their transformation.

These same verses argue from the analogy of the divine writing of the Ten Commandments on the two tables of stone. Paul infers that the Author of that ancient code, who once wrote with His finger upon stone, has now chosen the Apostle as His instrument to place that code upon the human hearts of the Corinthians. Indirectly, Paul is arguing also from the authority of Old Testament prophecies which had foretold just such a work. The Corinthians in all likelihood had often read the

following predictions from their sacred writings.

> . . . this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. Jer 31:33
>
> . . . For I will take you from among the heathen . . . from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. Eze 36:24-26

Lest these present claims should be construed as boasting, Paul hastens now to add:

> Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. vs 5,6

By these words Paul not only endeavors to safeguard himself against the charge of further boasting, but he also makes a transition in argument from the evidence for his personal claims to the evidence derived by a consideration of the superiority of the new dispensation of which he is a minister. He declares that God has appointed him a minister of the new testament, or as it should be translated, "of a new covenant" (RSV). This covenant is superior to the old covenant formerly known by the Jews, inasmuch as the new dispensation is marked by the gift of the Holy Spirit to believers. Now Paul proceeds to contrast the Mosaic economy with the Christian.

The commentator Wordsworth has summarised in excellent fashion the arguments of the foregoing verses. He says:

> The connexion of the sentences therefore is: I do not need letters of commendation. Ye are my Apostolic credentials. Your conversion to Christianity wrought by my instrumentality, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit poured upon you, through my ministry, are my testimonials, "known and read" by the eyes of all. Ye are Christ's Epistle ministered by me, --an Epistle written by the hand of the Holy Ghost, who has inscribed the Gospel by my

> means, not on tables of stone, but on your hearts. Not that I therefore claim any honour to myself. I am a mere diakonos, [diakonos a servant]. Christ is the Master; He is the only Source; I am a mere channel. He is the divine Agent; I am a mere instrument. But He has been pleased to employ and enable me to fulfil His promises and prophecies, and to write by me a New Covenant, not of Letter, but of Spirit; that is, not of a Law written on stone, but of the Spirit, writing on the heart; and teaching and enabling you to perform it, by the gracious outpourings of the Holy Ghost, shed upon you through my Apostolic ministry.[1]

Now Paul proceeds to contrast the Mosaic economy with the Christian age which he personally represents.

> But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance: which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? vs 7, 8

He refers to the Mosaic economy which was ushered in by the glorious descent of Jehovah upon Mount Sinai as "the ministration of death." When Israel had been a theocracy, every transgression of the Ten Commandments was considered as an act of rebellion, and it was immediately punished by the death penalty. Although judgment was so instantaneous and severe as to merit calling that dispensation a "ministration of death" yet it was still "glorious," affirmed Paul. He here alludes to the record in Ex 34:29-35 where Moses describes the shining of his face when he descended Mount Sinai and faced the people, with the tables of the law in his hand. According to that record, Moses had ultimately veiled himself for the benefit of the awe-struck Israelites. This glory, says Paul, was a fading one, but the glory of the New Testament age was never to pass away.

In the remaining verses of this passage Paul allegorises from the incident of the veiling of the face of Moses. He declares that the

---

[1]Wordsworth, Commentary, Vol. 2, p. 153.

temporary nature of the glory on the face of Moses was indicative of the temporary nature of the Mosaic economy. God intended that it should give way to the age of Christianity, the age of the New Covenant, which would ever be attended by the unfading glory of the ministering Holy Spirit. In the veil used by Moses, Paul sees a symbol of the present unbelief of the Jews which prevents their perceiving the glory of the gospel that he represents. In contrast he declares "But we all, with open [i.e. unveiled] face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." v 18. Thus by employing arguments based on the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, and by using allegory and symbolism, Paul contends for the great superiority of the ministry he represents, compared to the ministry of the Jewish economy. While such arguments employed in our day would probably not carry great weight, Paul was addressing people who were accustomed to such reasoning by the tradition of centuries. Every Bible parable is a kind of allegory, and the Jews had long been skilled in the allegorical method of interpretation.

> The Jews, in the days of Jesus, employed . . . especially the typico-allegorical interpretation. The Jews of Palestine endeavored by means of this mode of interpretation especially to elicit the secrets of futurity, which were said to be fully contained in the Old Testament.[1]

Similarly, the Greeks saw in many of their classics allegories concerning man's experience in this life. Inasmuch as even the Gentile members of the Corinthian church had become familiarised with the Jewish scriptures, Paul's mode of argument would seem entirely appropriate to them.

---

[1]John McClintock and James Strong, Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. 10 vols. and 2 supplementary volumes. 1st Edition (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1877), Vol. 4, p. 626.

The fourth chapter with its emphasis on Paul's manifestation of truth by holy living and teaching has been already discussed. In the next chapter he deals particularly with the accusations concerning his sanity and his motives. He says with reference to these charges:

> For whether we be beside ourselves, it is to God: or whether we be sober ("in our right mind" RSV), it is for your cause. For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh, . . . vs 13-16

If at times my enthusiasm has seemed like madness, says Paul, it was zeal for the service of God which so enthused me.

> 'Take whichever side of my life you like, assume that the whole of it is either the one or the other, where does selfishness come in? There is no room for it, either in the madness which is directed to God's glory, or in the sanity which is devoted to your edification.'[1]

Regarding his motives, it is Christ's love for him, and his love for Christ that has prompted all his words and deeds. If Christ has died for all, then it must mean that all were judicially condemned to death. And, therefore, those who accept His vicarious death on their behalf cannot now live selfishly as before. Rather, their whole life must be spent in Christ's service. Henceforward, our dealings with men will no longer be marked by carnal[2] considerations, such as wealth or other personal advantages. Thus I have preached, says the Apostle in effect, and thus I have lived. Where the A. V. has "henceforth know we no man after the flesh," the Greek has the "we" before the verb in the emphatic position, thus indicating that while some others (his detractors) were

---

[1]Plummer, Cambridge Bible, p. 53.

[2]The word is here employed in the Pauline sense of non-spiritual.

guided by fleshly and carnal considerations, such is not the case with the Apostle.

Now Paul gives a test whereby both he and his accusers may be measured. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." v 17 To demonstrate that all true workers for Christ are transformed in nature and purposes is the objective of the following chapter. He proposes what should be the behaviour of all who believed in Christ's vicarious death. The passage is interwoven with side-glances at the accusations made against himself by the false teachers at Corinth, and in these verses he presents an account of his own ministry which might well have shamed his adversaries. The account provides material for his defense by those who esteemed him in the church; and when applied as a measuring rod to the members of the opposing party, the latter could not but suffer in reputation. The passage is as follows:

> We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain. . . . Giving no offense in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed: but in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings, by pureness, by knowledge, by long suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing and yet possessing all things.
>
> 6:1-10

This passage, appearing as it does towards the end of the first major section of this discourse, reveals the unity of theme throughout the first seven chapters. In these verses the Apostle's two major concepts regarding sufferings for Christ's sake, and an open life of

manifest holiness, are linked together in powerful appeal.[1] Patently these verses are a skillful presentation of the argument that no man who is a deceiver could possibly live the arduous and upright life here pictured. The allusions to "dishonour," "evil report," "deceivers," etc., are obviously reminiscent of the calumnies that had been uttered against him at Corinth. In this series of paradoxes are significant concepts which not only defended Paul's own course, but provided inspiration for saints, sages, and martyrs for centuries to come. It is unfortunately too easy a matter to read them cursorily without grasping the magnitude of their meaning. How much is involved, for example, in the culminating paradox--"as having nothing, and yet possessing all things"? Thus ". . . he utters the truth that in the absolute surrender of the thought of calling anything its own, the soul becomes the heir of the universe."[2] While these words carry logical weight, it is apparent that their appeal is specifically to the feelings of his audience, and as such will appear again in our discussion of pathetic proof.

In the following chapter Paul concludes this section of this discourse by praising the majority group at Corinth for their acceptance of the counsel in his preceding letter. He ends on this note: "I rejoice therefore that I have confidence in you in all things."

While the first seven chapters have been occupied with Paul's delineation of true ministry, and the defense of his own participation therein, the middle section of this epistle is concerned with the very practical issue of a collection on behalf of the poor. How does he endeavor to persuade the Corinthians to give liberally to this collection? What are his main arguments in these three chapters?

---

[1]The pathetic strength of this passage is discussed under Pathos. By "powerful" appeal we mean one that was powerful to those who thought as the Corinthians did.

[2]Plumptre, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 385.

In the discussion regarding pathetic proof it will be pointed out that we have excellent examples of motivation in this part of Paul's message. However a logical emphasis is also present. First he argues that if the poverty-stricken believers in Macedonia could freely donate from their pitiful store, then the Corinthians, residents of a richer district, could follow suit.

> We want you to know, brethren, about the grace of God which has been shown in the churches of Macedonia, for in a severe test of affliction, their abundance of joy and their extreme poverty have overflowed in a wealth of liberality on their part. For they gave according to their means, as I can testify, and beyond their means, of their own free will, begging us earnestly for the favor of taking part in the relief of the saints--and this, not as we expected, but first they gave themselves to the Lord and to us by the will of God. Accordingly we have urged Titus that as he had already made a beginning, he should also complete among you this gracious work. Now as you excel in everything--in faith, in utterance, in knowledge, in all earnestness, and in your love for us--see that you excel in this gracious work also.
>
> 8:1-7 RSV

By the churches of Macedonia, Paul refers particularly to those of Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea. He stresses two things with reference to these churches. (1) Their dire poverty; and (2) their great liberality. Could any stronger points be made than these in urging that the richer Corinthians should be able to follow the example of the Macedonian believers? It is significant also that Paul attributes the generosity primarily to "the grace of God" bestowed upon these other churches. Thus if God could so move upon others in this way, He could do so again at Corinth if the believers were willing.

Paul's next argument is stronger still. He refers now to the example of Christ Himself. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." v 9 If God Himself had

set the example of giving, if His Son who was "Lord of all" had nevertheless condescended in the incarnation to accept the poverty of a Galilean peasant, then surely it was only reasonable that His followers would follow Him in sacrificial giving. So Paul argues.

Some might respond by asserting that they could not give as others would because of their poverty. Paul meets this before it is voiced by expressing the principle of proportionate giving, and suggests that the time could come when they would receive similar assistance if needed.

> For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened: but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be equality: as it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack. vs 12-15

The last sentence is intended by Paul as Scriptural support for his counsel. He is quoting from Ex 16:18, the record of the gathering of the manna, and its proportionate distribution after its collection. The reference is particularly apt.

Lest some should restrain their giving in case proper care was not taken of the funds, Paul outlines the plan for safeguarding the offerings. Members chosen by different churches are to travel together with the funds. "Avoiding this," says Paul, "that no man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us: providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of man." vs 20, 21. He is not so fanatical as to declare that a clear conscience on the part of the one in charge of the finance was all that was necessary. He is concerned with avoiding even the appearance of evil.

In the next chapter the Apostle argues from the analogy of the harvest.

> But this I say, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver. And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work . . . Now he that ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness; being enriched in everything to all bountifulness, which causeth through us thanksgiving to God. 9:6-11

In an age where a far greater proportion of people were engaged in agriculture than in our own day, these allusions to sowing and reaping were entirely appropriate. The metaphor is supported by a Scriptural quotation--"For God loveth a cheerful giver," found in the Septuagint translation of Prov 22:8. This love of God for the liberal giver will result in such blessing that the generous believer will "always have all sufficiency in all things." Probably Paul reached this conclusion on the basis of Old Testament promises which he accepted as divinely inspired. Typical of these is Proverbs 11:24, 25. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth. . . . The liberal soul shall be made fat: and he that watereth shall be watered also himself."

The next argument in this chapter is that several good purposes will be served by the bountiful offering that is suggested. Not only would the trials of the impoverished believers be alleviated, but much thanksgiving would redound to God. Furthermore it would be demonstrated that the Christian profession of the Corinthian church members was a genuine one.

> For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God; whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men. . . . 9:12, 13

Finally, Paul does in the conclusion of his appeal what he had done at the commencement. He argues from example, the example of God's generosity in Christ. The statement he makes is the more powerful because it is simple and unadorned. Without stopping to moralise, he merely adds the crisp thanksgiving--"Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." 9:15

Thus, in this section regarding the financial collection to be made, Paul has argued from example, from analogy, from the authority of Scripture, and from causal reasoning.

The last three chapters of this address constitute a separate section. They are marked by an entirely different tone from the preceding.

> At this stage there was manifestly another pause, of greater or less length, in the act of dictating. Fresh thoughts of a different kind are working in his mind, and rousing feelings of a very different kind from those which had been just expressed. At last he breaks silence and begins anew.[1]

Kling points out that the particle "de," translated "Now" in the KJV., is the mark of the introduction of a new section. He quotes from Dean Stanley's introductory comment on this passage as follows:

> The conciliatory and affectionate strain of entreaty which pervaded the first part, is exchanged for that of stern command, and almost menace: there is still the same expression of devotion to the Corinthian Church.[2]

The first verses of this section contain several allusions to the criticisms of the Apostle's detractors.

> Now I Paul myself beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, who in presence am base among you, but being absent am bold toward you: but I beseech you, that I may not be bold when I am present with that confidence, wherewith I think to be bold against some, which think of us as if we walked according to the flesh. 10:1, 2

---

[1]Plumptre, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 397.

[2]Ibid., p. 163.

Apparently the critics had ridiculed Paul's physical appearance as "base," and contended that he could evidence boldness only by means of letters from a distance. The reference to "walking according to the flesh" is an allusion to the accusation that carnal motives such as greed motivated him. In response, Paul asserts:

> For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. . . . Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's. 10:3-7

The argument is that if the Apostle's evangelistic warfare were conducted on worldly principles, his weapons also would be worldly and ultimately unsuccessful. To Paul, the contrary is the case however, for he declares that even "strongholds" of heathenism have been made to capitulate, and the very thoughts of men's hearts have been redirected through the power of his gospel. The question "Do ye look on things after the outward appearance?" is a warning against a mode of reasoning which the Corinthian believers themselves would acknowledge to be unchristian.

Next Paul quotes the very words of the false teachers. "For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak and his speech contemptible." 10:10 It is the last phrase which is of particular interest to the speech critic. What was meant by the criticism that Paul's speech was contemptible? It could hardly have reference to the content of his speeches if his letters admittedly were "weighty and powerful." One has but to read the address on Mars Hill, or that given before Agrippa, to be convinced of the quality of Pauline ideas as expressed in his typical oratory. It is more likely that this

particular criticism has reference to the style and delivery of the Apostle as being bereft of the qualities most esteemed in this age of the second sophistic.[1] For the present let us notice that the Apostle does not meet the argument by a defense of his speaking ability. Instead he works by pointing out the spur of conceit which evidently was actuating his opponents and thus discredits these Judaizers. Apparently he believed as some moderns, that even in speech, attack is often the best defense.

> For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves; but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise. . . . For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth. 10:12, 18

In the next chapter three arguments can be traced. First, Paul points out that his financial independence when among the Corinthians was good evidence of the purity of his intentions. Secondly, he warns these Christians that if Satan himself can masquerade as an "angel of light," "it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness." In other words he is saying, Do not be deceived by lofty claims and pretensions to righteousness, inasmuch as evil never appears in its true form, but instead it counterfeits truth. Thirdly, whatever qualifications the false teachers claimed to possess actually existed in a far greater measure in the one they repudiated. The following is an abridgement of the line of thought to be found in the text.

> Have I committed an offence in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely? I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service. And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man: for that which was lacking to me the brethren which

---

[1]This point is elaborated elsewhere in this dissertation.

> came from Macedonia supplied: and in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself. . . . But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. . . . Seeing that many glory after the flesh, I will glory also. . . . whereinsoever any is bold, (I speak foolishly,) I am bold also. Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? . . . I am more; in labours more abundant. . . . 11:7-23

Chapter twelve is intended further to substantiate the claims of the missionary Apostle. Paul speaks of supernatural revelations vouchsafed to him, and also of the "thorn in the flesh," some physical infirmity, permitted of God in order to keep him from being "exalted above measure." The argument is that his privileges have been so great that God has of necessity taken special care to keep the exalted messenger from spiritual pride. Paul links this thought with the theme he had introduced at the beginning of his discourse, that the faithful endurance of suffering on the part of God's messengers both vindicates them and exalts the power of God which operates through weak and harried instruments.

> And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong. 12:9, 10

Paul, having made these disclosures of his divinely-granted privileges, now drops all reserve and asserts his claim vigorously.

> I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. vs 11, 12

He turns the tables and focusses the spotlight upon the Corinthians, saying:

> Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates. 13:5

Thus in conclusion, Paul urges the Corinthians to look to their own salvation. He says with some irony that this should be their chief concern even if he should be considered by some as reprobate.

> But we pray God that you may not do wrong--not that we may appear to have met the test, but that you may do what is right, though we may seem to have failed. 13:7 RSV

Then follows the farewell--concise, pointed, hortatory, and affectionate.

> Finally, brethren, farewell. Mend your ways, heed my appeal, agree with one another, live in peace, and the God of love and peace will be with you. Greet one another with a holy kiss. All the saints greet you. The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all. 13:11-14 RSV

This epistle, the most agitated and stormy of all Paul's addresses, closes with the most formal and solemn of his benedictions. It is possible that the proverbial pin could have been heard if dropped in the Corinthian assembly at this point. The soaring flight of the Apostle's self-defense had been abruptly interrupted as if in mid-course by a warning to the listeners that they needed to be more concerned with their own conduct than with his, and then had come the final pungent and solemn words of farewell. The effect would be analogous to that upon a passenger in a fast-moving automobile who suddenly heard the brakes screech, and found the vehicle within a foot of the edge of a precipice.

It is evident from the foregoing that Paul's lines of argument are mainly deductive in character. Throughout he postulates truths derived from divine revelation which the Corinthians already claim to accept.

From these premises, based on divine authority, Paul argues to the conclusions he seeks. He reasons from cause, sign, and from analogy. Throughout most of his apology there is evident restraint which actually intensifies his assertions by inferring that much more could be said under each head. We miss the inductive reasoning so characteristic of modern scientific method. However, addressing as he did, an audience committed to a belief in absolutes, Paul's reliance upon deduction is not inappropriate. At times, some arguments such as the one based on analogy and allegory in the third chapter may seem strained to modern minds. When we recall the modes of hermeneutics characteristic of the first century, however, we are enabled to view such arguments in clearer light.

Analysis of Pathos

> . . . pathetic proof includes all those materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas.[1]

Such a definition as this would seem to include both appeals to the emotions and those to the motives. The following analysis of pathetic proof in this discourse is based upon such an understanding. In the words of Irving J. Lee:

> It is more important that the critic define the argument as one which involves the notion of fame, wealth, health, fear, anger, or pity, and define it accurately, than that he be concerned whether fame, wealth, health, are topoi of happiness or topoi of the emotions.

With this in mind we would ask the question: Did Paul "evince an intelligent understanding of the nature of the problem, and did he apply

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 358.

[2]Irving J. Lee, "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, VI (1939), p. 85.

that insight to the practical task of disposing his hearers in his behalf?"[1]

The problem in this instance was very evidently one of relationship between the Corinthian church and Paul. As has been pointed out, a small group had turned against the Apostle, being influenced by some critical teachers who were strongly Jewish in leaning. Strong accusations had been levelled against the person, the character, and the teachings of the founder of the local church. Paul's objective, therefore, is to vindicate his apostleship, quicken the love of those still loyal to him, and shame the minority group into repentance. A side-issue is the matter of the collection for the impoverished believers in Jerusalem. Obviously the motives and emotions to which Paul must appeal are the affections and the sentiments primarily. Such motives as property, power, expediency and others of similar character could hardly play a prominent place in solving the problem that existed, inasmuch as Paul's entire gospel stresses loftier impulses than these, and because the situation revolved around attitudes to a person rather than to things.

On close examination it will be found that every chapter of the epistle, except the two relative to the offering, appeals to the affections of love and sympathy and to the sentiment of gratitude. Some of these passages have already been referred to in the discussion of their logical significance. Now they are considered with reference to their content of pathetic proof. Their close relationship to ethical proof will be discussed separately.

Chapter One

> For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life: but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 361.

> in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us; ye also helping together by prayer for us. vs 8-11

Here Paul alludes to the riot at Ephesus and his own proximity to death. The picture is drawn of a man so surrounded by trouble that there are no visible signs of help. He attributes his deliverance not only to the goodness of God but also to the effectiveness of the prayers of those to whom he is now writing. Hereby Paul implies the existence of the genuine love which many at Corinth held for him. He tenders his gratitude for their intercessions, and thus encourages the continuance of such. Thus also his friends would be spurred on to defend the absentee Apostle. He continues:

> For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward. For we write none other things unto you, than what ye read or acknowledge; and I trust ye shall acknowledge even to the end; as also ye have acknowledged us in part, that we are your rejoicing, even as ye also are our's in the day of the Lord Jesus. vs 12-14

Thus the Corinthians are reminded of the upright behaviour of the Apostle when among them. Furthermore, they are assured that Paul's joy at the time of the second advent would lie in the fact of their salvation in that day. It is a parallel statement to the one addressed to the Thessalonians when Paul declared "Ye are our glory and joy." By the relating of his troubles in Asia, and by the references to the mutual love between himself and the Corinthians, Paul in this chapter has endeavored to tighten the cords of such affections.

Chapter Two

> But I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness. For if I make you sorry, who is he then that maketh me glad, but the same which is made sorry by me? . . . For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be grieved, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you.
> vs 1-4

It is noteworthy that the Apostle's primary method of arousing the affections of the Corinthians is to demonstrate his own love towards them. The words above portray his reluctance to visit Corinth with rebuke as his main purpose. Instead he had sent a letter which had been so composed as to manifest the fact that he desired only their welfare, even when called by necessity to administer correction. His anxiety regarding their condition is shown in verses 12 and 13.

> Furthermore, when I came to Troas to preach Christ's gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother; but taking my leave of them, I went from thence into Macedonia.

Although he had found the people at Troas responsive to his preaching, Paul had left the city to seek Titus and his news regarding the church at Corinth. Thus was demonstrated how large a place these believers held in his heart. That the Corinthians should reciprocate this love automatically follows.

Chapter Three

> . . . need we, as some others, epistles of commendation to you, or letters of commendation from you? Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men: forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us. . . . vs 1-3

Once more Paul "opens his heart," as if to show that the Corinthians are engraved thereon. And he reminds them that the change

that has been wrought in their lives owed itself to him, as the human instrumentality. They were indebted to the Apostle for the transformation which all men recognized as having taken place in them.

Chapter Four

> But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us. We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we areperplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh. So then death worketh in us, but life in you. 4:7-12.

Again we have allusions to the many perils of the missionary life of this Christian labourer. The last sentence particularly has pathetic potency.

> "You," he seems to say, "reap the fruit of my sufferings. The 'dying' is all my own; you know nothing of that conflict with pain and weakness; but the 'life' which is the result of that experience works in you as well as in me, and finds in you the chief sphere of its operation."[1]

The contrast expressed in this sentence would seem an effective one for quickening the emotions of love, shame, and gratitude in those who heard it.

Chapter Five

> Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences. For we commend not ourselves again unto you, but give you occasion to glory on our behalf, that ye may have somewhat to answer them which glory in appearance, and not in heart. For whether we be beside

---

[1]Plumptre, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 377.

> ourselves, it is to God: or whether we be sober, it is for your cause. For the love of Christ constraineth us. 5:11-14

Paul's own motives are here laid bare. It is his awareness of the coming Judgment, and of the love of Christ that compels him to labor as he does. "And," he assures the Corinthians, "all this labor' is for your cause.'" It is not for his exaltation, but for their salvation that he labours; and that because of this the believers should be well able to defend him against those "which glory in appearance, and not in heart." This is another appeal for their love and gratitude, with some delicate overtones which, if perceived, would be likely also to work shame in those who heard the letter.

Chapter Six

In this chapter we have "an outburst of impassioned eloquence"[1] which culminates in the most direct appeal for genuine love from his disciples towards himself that is to be found in the entire range of Paul's epistles. The entire passage is worth quoting as it reveals the approach to this high point of pathos.

> We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain. . . . Giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed: But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things. vs 1-10

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 413.

> O ye Corinthians, our mouth is open unto you, our heart is enlarged. Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels [affections]. vs 11, 12
>
> There was manifestly a pause here [v 10] as the letter was dictated. The rush of thoughts had reached its highest point. He rests, and feels almost as if some apology were needed for so vehement an outpouring of emotion. And now he writes as if personally pleading with them. Nowhere else in the whole range of his epistles do we find any parallel to this form of speech--this "O ye Corinthians!" He has to tell them that if his mouth has been opened with an unusual freedom it is because his heart has felt a more than common expansion. . . . There was no narrowness in him. In that large heart of his there was room for them and for a thousand others. It had, as it were, an infinite elacticity in its sympathies. The narrowness was found in their own "bowels"--i.e., in their own affections. They would not make room for him in those hearts that were so straitened by passions, and prejudices, and antipathies.[1]

In a discourse that is marked by emotion throughout, this entire passage represents a 'high-water mark.' The picture here drawn of missionary experience with its culminating series of paradoxes, and its final appeal is cumulative in emotional effect. It is provocative of love and admiration for the man who could endure such a life. The Corinthians could hardly fail to contrast their own experience with what is described in these lines, and shame would probably result for many.

Chapter Seven

In this chapter, as in the preceding, there are strong appeals to the affections of love and sympathy. Here also such appeals are made chiefly through a revelation of the Apostle's own love. He addresses them as "dearly beloved," and continues:

> Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man. I speak not this to condemn you: for I have said before that ye are in our hearts to die and

---

[1]Plumptre, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 386.

> live with you. . . . For, when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears. Nevertheless, God, that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus; and not by his coming only, but by the consolation wherewith he was comforted in you, when he told us your earnest desire, your mourning, your fervent mind toward me; so that I rejoiced the more. . . . Wherefore, though I wrote unto you, I did it not for his cause that had done the wrong, . . . but that our care for you in the sight of God might appear unto you. . . . I rejoice therefore that I have confidence in you in all things. 7:1-16

These words were a continued revelation of the affection that Paul held for the Corinthians. He stressed the suspense he endured in Macedonia while he awaited news of them, and the joy at last when the good news came. The chief reason for his first letter is mentioned, namely, that his love towards them might be made manifest.

Chapter Eight

In this chapter and the following we have Paul's appeal on behalf of the poverty-stricken believers at Jerusalem. He no longer appeals for himself as in the earlier chapters. His main aim now is to motivate the believers at Corinth to give liberally in the coming collection. This he does by citing the example of the Macedonian givers, by reminding them that Christ was the greatest of givers, by intimating that some day they may be helped by the contributions of others, and by appealing to their desire for social approval. The motive of self-preservation is addressed by Paul's reminder that God is able to more than make up to them all that they give.

Appeal to Emulation

> Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep

> poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to their power, I bear record, yea, and beyond their power they were willing of themselves; praying us with much intreaty that we would receive the gift. . . . Therefore as ye abound in every thing, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also. vs 1-7

It is significant that even in this passage Paul urges the love of the Corinthians for himself as another motivating factor for their generosity. His words are carefully chosen. When speaking of liberality, he calls it a "grace." The literal meaning of this word is "gift." It is particularly applied in the New Testament to the generous attitude of God towards sinners. In this immediate context we read of "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," and this grace was revealed by the fact "that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." Thus Paul infers that the attitude which he is encouraging is itself born of God, the original Giver. Inasmuch as the church abounds in other graces such as faith and knowledge, the Apostle urges that a demonstration of the further grace of liberality will reveal a well-rounded Christian experience. Tactfully he inserts the fact that he is not trying to command what their conduct should be. "I speak not by commandment, but by occasion of the forwardness of others, and to prove the sincerity of your love."

> He is a sensitive man dealing with sensitive people; and he points out that he is not giving orders which are not needed and would mar the beauty of their liberality: he is giving his judgment as to what is fitting and fair.[1]

Thus this first section of the chapter, while stressing mostly the motive of worthy emulation, includes subsidiary appeals to self-respect, and their love for him and for Christ.

---

[1]Plummer, The Cambridge Bible, p. 79.

Appeal to Self-preservation

> For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened: but by an equality that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be equality: as it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack. vs 12-15

Paul is saying that God does not require of them to give more than is possible. Giving is to be proportionate according to each man's individual pecuniary position. Furthermore, the time may come when the Corinthians will be on the receiving end, as other churches would contribute to their need should the occasion arise. At the time of the collecting of the manna, those who had gathered much shared with those who had gathered little, and finally each had sufficient. Even so, says Paul, should it be among Christians at this time. The same motive of self-preservation is touched upon by Paul's description of the careful plans for safeguarding the funds for Jerusalem. vs 17-22

Appeal to the Desire for Social Approval

> Wherefore shew ye to them, and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf . . . For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready: lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. 8:24-9:4

Here it is intimated that if the Corinthians failed to live up to the Apostle's boast concerning them, it would be a permanent disgrace. Regarding the last verse, one commentator has written:

> We are not to regard this little parenthesis (we say not ye, . . .) as a mere pleasantry, but on the other hand as a delicate attempt to stimulate their feelings of self-respect; since the shame would indeed be theirs if the Apostle's expression of confidence in them should not be borne out in fact.[1]

Another writer says:

> In this little sentence we may discover the extreme delicacy of Paul's feelings, and the affectionate civility which characterized his intercourse, but which are especially prominent in this most personal of all his Epistles.[2]

Further Appeal to the Motive of Self-preservation

Lest the Corinthians should feel that they are lessening their financial security by their contributions, it is pointed out that their own generosity will more than be paralleled by that of God, who will undertake to guarantee their having sufficient for every need.

> . . . He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully. Every man as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver. And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work: . . . Now he that ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness. . . . 9:6-10

The forcefulness of the final sentence of this chapter should not be overlooked. "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." Thus Paul closes his appeal by a burst of praise concerning the blessings of redemption made available by God's gift in Christ. The implication at this time of these words is obvious. New Christians could not but desire to follow the example of God in all things.

---

[1]Kling in Lange's Commentary, p. 152.

[2]W. F. Besser, cited by Kling in Lange's Commentary, p. 153.

In the final section of this discourse, the last four chapters, Paul returns to the defense of his apostolic ministry. This defense is more aggressive in nature than that found in the first seven chapters. Despite this fact, we find similar motivation employed as the Apostle solicited the response of love to his own great affection for the church. In the tenth chapter Paul suggests that he will not boast about labours in regions unknown to them as his opponents had done. He will only remind them that they had the evidence of his effectual labours among themselves at Corinth. His implication is that they would never have received the gospel but for his own ministry. Therefore of all men, Paul suggests that the Corinthians should love him the most.

> But we [Gk. emphatic] will not boast beyond limit, but will keep to the limits God has apportioned us, to reach even to you. For we are not overextending ourselves, as though we did not reach you; we were the first to come all the way to you with the gospel of Christ. We do not boast beyond limit, in other men's labours; but our hope is that as your faith increases, our field among you may be greatly enlarged, so that we may preach the gospel in lands beyond you, without boasting of work already done in another's field. 10:13-16

Chapter Eleven

This chapter contains what Farrar calls "the most marvellous fragment ever written of any biography."

> . . . This is a fragment beside which, not merely the ordinary biographies of comfortable Christians, but even the most imperilled lives of the most suffering saints shrink into insignificance. It is the very heroism of unselfishness--the life of an "Apostle of the Third Heaven."[1]

This passage seems capable of exciting in the Corinthians such noble sentiments as would inspire them to follow the self-sacrificing example

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, p. 239.

of their founder. Even when we read it two thousand years after it was dictated, admiration and the desire to emulate such a noble life are awakened.

> Are they ministers of Christ? . . . I am more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watching often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches. vs 23-28

These verses describing the perils incident to loving missionary service add emphasis to his earlier declarations of affection for the Greek believers. He had affirmed "I am jealous over you with godly jealousy," and again later, ". . . because I love you not? God knoweth." vs 2, 11. It is difficult to imagine any more powerful motivation to love and sympathy than such self-revelations as found in this and the preceding chapters.

Chapter Twelve

Words that are wistful and tinged with sadness and disappointment are to be found as the Apostle approaches his conclusion.

> . . . I seek not yours, but you. . . . and I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved. 12:14, 15

Such words were probably provocative of intense shame in those who heard them. It is inferred that the Corinthians had miserably failed in defending the one to whom they owed so much. They had been prepared to countenance false teachers even when the latter attacked

the author of their spiritual life. Paul certainly had a right to declare: ". . . for I ought to have been commended of you." v 11 Despite his disappointment in them, the Apostle still addresses the Corinthians as his "dearly beloved." ". . . we do all things, dearly beloved, for your edifying." v 19

Chapter Thirteen

The high point of pathetic appeal is now passed. Almost abruptly the Apostle curtails his address. In this closing passage we have additional implied rebukes of the Corinthians' failure towards him.

> . . . if I come again, I will not spare: since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, . . . Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates? But I trust that ye shall know that we are not reprobates. vs 2, 3, 5, 6

Throughout this discourse can be found no appeal to such motives as selfish expedience, power, selfish gain, self-assertion, or their like. The major emphasis throughout is upon the affections and sentiments, particularly love, sympathy, and gratitude.

Analysis of Ethos

It is apparent that the arguments with pathetic appeal quoted from the first seven chapters and the last three have a close relationship to ethical proof. In the words of Thonssen and Baird:

> It is apparent that the distinction between emotional and ethical proof is not always clear; and in some instances it may be virtually nonexistent. Ethos and pathos have, indeed, much in common. The speaker who establishes his own moral integrity and imposes strictures upon that of his opponent is unquestionably using both ethical and pathetic proof. He is establishing credence in his own probity and character, and, at the same time,

> is predisposing the minds of the hearers toward the readier acceptance of his cause.[1] (Emphasis ours)

This is exactly the position with the arguments of second Corinthians. Paul's main burden is to "establish his own moral integrity and impose strictures upon his opponents." Insofar as his pathetic proof reveals his own character as one of worth, and his ability as superior, to that extent at least such argument is also ethical in nature.

Let us consider first the arguments which have bearing upon his character.

> In general, a speaker focuses attention upon the probity of his character if he (1) associates either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated; (2) bestows, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause; (3) links the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous; (4) removes or minimizes unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent; (5) relies upon authority derived from his personal experience; and (6) creates the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking.[2]

We shall appraise Paul's arguments in the light of these canons. First, does he "associate either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated?" Before answering this, it must be admitted that this criterion is very limited in affording conclusive proof of the ethical appeal of the speaker. It would be possible for even a reprobate to mouth pious platitudes. Nevertheless, this canon has its place, inasmuch as the indication of what the speaker esteems will influence his audience if its members already holds his system of values. In the present instance Paul links himself and his message with the Source of all virtue. In every chapter he refers to God, and in every chapter except one he makes mention of Jesus Christ. There are over

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 386.

[2]Ibid., p. 387.

one hundred and twenty references to the Godhead in these thirteen chapters. This is the cumulative total of the mentions made of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. In each chapter there is an average of nine such references. If the discourse gave evidence that Paul's character was the reverse of pious, these one hundred and twenty references could serve only to discredit him; but inasmuch as the totality of evidence reveals him as devout, this constant mention of Divinity strengthens his ethical proof.

The subsidiary topics discussed in this letter are also virtuous and elevated in nature. Frequent references to the gospel and to the truths of that gospel can be found in each section of the message, inextricably interwoven with the particular idea of each paragraph. Minor themes include the sacredness of the Scriptures (2:17 etc.), the lofty nature of the Christian ministry (chs 3 and 6), faith (5:7; 4:18), separation from evil (6:14-18), the duty of Christian benevolence (chs 8 and 9), and the purpose of suffering (1:3-10; 12:7-10 etc.). It is apparent that Paul indeed associates himself and his message with what is virtuous and elevated.

Does the Apostle "bestow, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause"? Concerning himself, the Apostle admits that the claims he has been constrained to make in this direction are likely to be misinterpreted. He says "Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly: and indeed bear with me. . . . Let no man think me a fool; if otherwise, yet as a fool receive me, that I may boast myself a little. That which I speak, I speak it not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly, in this confidence of boasting." 11:1, 16, 17. He is well aware that "self-praise is no recommendation," and declares "For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth." 10:18 It seems obvious that the

business of defending himself is distasteful to the Apostle. He makes clear the reason why he is making this effort to vindicate his character and message.

> As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia. Wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth. But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion. 11:10-12

> For we commend not ourselves again unto you, but give you occasion to glory on our behalf, that ye may have somewhat to answer them which glory in appearance, and not in heart. 5:12

With the motive for his defense clearly stated, Paul seeks to vindicate himself throughout the epistle by arguments and claims regarding the purity of his character and intent. These we have considered in the section dealing with the development of ideas in the letter. However, some of the verses which particularly relate to this present topic should be mentioned. In ch 2:14-17 we have a summary of the ethical significance of the first chapters in Paul's defense. Having referred to his ministry at Ephesus, and the "open door" at Troas, he exclaims:

> Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things? For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.

Thus Paul affirms that he is a successful instrument in the Hand of God, ministering life to all who believe his message, and judgment to those who disbelieve. His self-praise is tempered by the rhetorical question: "Who is sufficient for these things?" The claim to sincerity is a repetition of his words in the preceding chapter in verse twelve:

> For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom,

> but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation [conduct] in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward.

In the third chapter we have the claim to effective ministry reaffirmed in the declaration that God has made him an "able minister of the new testament." v 6 The words immediately preceding were probably intended to ward off the charge of boasting. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." v 5 The verses quoted from this chapter show that Paul is concerned with vindicating his cause rather than merely himself. It is the "new testament," i.e. "the new covenant" of the gospel, with which he is concerned. His own standing is important only inasmuch as this affects the attitude of the Corinthians towards his message.

In the next chapter are similar affirmations.

> Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. . . . For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. 4:1, 2, 5

Again in chapter seven and verse two:

> Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man. I speak not this to condemn you: for I have said before, that ye are in our hearts to die and live with you.

And in chapter ten:

> Now I Paul myself beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ. . . . For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh. . . . If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's. vs 1, 3, 7

In the following chapter Paul claims equality with the leaders among the Twelve Apostles, and says that this is demonstrable by the quality and extent of his knowledge and his service.

> For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. But though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge; but we have been throughly [thoroughly] made manifest among you in all things.
>
> . . . in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. . . . vs 5, 6, 23

As the climax to his claims Paul refers to his visions from God.

> I must boast: there is nothing to be gained by it, but I will go on to visions and revelations of the Lord. I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven--whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows. And I know that this man was caught up into Paradise. . . . and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter. 12:1-4 RSV

The miracles he had worked are alluded to in confirmation of his apostleship.

> The signs of a true apostle were performed among you in all patience, with signs and wonders and mighty works. v 12 RSV

Lest once more these statements should be construed as vain boasting, Paul closes his defense with the words:

> Again, think ye that we excuse ourselves unto you? We speak before God in Christ: but we do all things, dearly beloved, for your edifying. 12:19

Thus there seems to be ample evidence that the Apostle bestows "with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, . . . and his cause."

Does Paul "link the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous?" Many of Paul's references to his critics are asides rather than direct attack. For example he asks: "Do we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, <u>as some others</u>, epistles of commendation to you. . . ." 3:1 And again, "For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise." 10:12 Paul's main method of repudiating the character of his opponents is to evidence

his own purity of motive and his diligence in service. Thus he suggests a contrast with the critics which was likely to have proved painful to them. However, towards the end of his discourse, the Apostle directly links the opposition and its cause with the very personification of wickedness, Satan himself.

> For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works. 11:13-15

And with bitter irony he adds references to the behaviour of the Judaizing teachers.

> For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise. For ye suffer, if a man brings you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face. vs 19, 20

Thus does Paul link his opponents "with what is not virtuous."

The next canon for estimating effective demonstration of a speaker's good character is to enquire whether he "removed or minimized unfavourable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent." Most of the section concerning the development of ideas has application at this point. As has been mentioned, this whole discourse has for its chief end the defense of Paul. Thus ethical argument predominates throughout rather than constituting a minor factor as in many secular speeches. (This should not be understood as implying that ethical proof is "minor" in importance in gauging the persuasive value of any speech. We believe the contrary to be the case.) Most of this address to the Corinthian believers consists of rebuttal of the accusations made by the schismatics against the Apostle's person, character, and teaching.

Has Paul "relied upon authority derived from his personal experience, and created the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking?" These last criteria find fulfillment in verses already quoted. In the first chapter, Paul referred to his experience at Ephesus, and the Divine deliverance which came to him there. In the second chapter, the successful preaching at Troas was mentioned. Thereafter, we have references to the results of the Apostle's preaching among the Corinthians themselves (chs 3, 10, and 11 particularly) and also concise summaries of his missionary labours (such as in 11:22-33, and 10:13-16). In such passages Paul emphasizes the authority that was rightly his as a result of a divinely-attended ministry. The epistle as a whole breathes the spirit of sincerity, and such verses as the following are typical of the Apostle's attitude towards his hearers.

> Our mouth is open unto you, Corinthians; our heart is wide. You are not restricted by us, but you are restricted in your own affections. In return--I speak as to children--widen your hearts also. 6:10-13 RSV

> Behold, the third time I am ready to come to you; and I will not be burdensome to you: for I seek not your's, but you: for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved. 12:14, 15

The emphasis throughout upon the sufferings and toils of Paul also suggests the impression of his absolute sincerity.

Thus far, under the heading of ethical proof, we have considered the indications in 2 Corinthians of the probity of Paul's character. Aristotle suggested that a second feature inspiring belief is "sagacity." The more modern term is "competence."

> With certain qualifications varying with the circumstances, it may be said that a speaker helps to establish the impression of sagacity if he (1) uses what is popularly called common sense;

> (2) acts with tact and moderation; (3) displays a sense of good taste; (4) reveals a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; and (5) shows through the way in which he handles speech materials that he is possess of intellectual integrity and wisdom.[1]

Let us consider this discourse with reference to these canons concerning "competence." First of all, does Paul manifest common sense? It would seem apparent that one who can boast of a missionary record such as is several times referred to in this letter must of necessity be gifted with common sense, in order to have survived and to have accomplished so much.

It is, however, particularly in the business-like arrangements which Paul describes with reference to the gifts of the believers, that we see clear evidence of his common sense. He is manifestly concerned not only that the Corinthians should develop philanthropic graces but also that their donations should be cared for in such a way as to avoid the appearance of evil and secondly, that the collection should safely reach its destination. To accomplish these ends, Paul has with him fellow-labourers elected by various churches, who could act both as auditors and guardians of the money collected.

> With him (Titus) we are sending the brother who is famous among all the churches for his preaching of the gospel; and not only that, but he has been appointed by the churches to travel with us in this gracious work which we are carrying on, for the glory of the Lord and to show our good will. We intend that no one should blame us about this liberal gift which we are administering, for we aim at what is honorable not only in the Lord's sight but also in the sight of men. And with them we are sending our brother whom we have often tested and found earnest in many matters, but who is now more earnest than ever because of his great confidence in you. As for Titus, he is my partner and fellow worker in your service; and as for our brethren, they are messengers of the churches, the glory of Christ. 8:18-23 RSV

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 387.

Are there evidences of "tact and moderation" in this epistle? Probably the greatest evidence of tact to be found here is that the Apostle's rebuke to those who listen to his accusers is clothed about with fervid expressions of his own love for them. The epistle does not begin with the main question agitating Paul. That is, he does not commence by haranguing the Corinthians about their fickleness as demonstrated by their harbouring of the Judaizing teachers. Instead, Paul seeks to win their affection by referring to the trials he has had at Ephesus. He does not rail against his enemies but instead reveals his moderation by the fact that his allusions to these are mainly "on the side." Furthermore, when he refers to his own self-sacrificing ministry among the Corinthians, he chooses to speak in the general terms of a moderate spirit rather than so to delineate his sacrifices on their behalf as to multiply their shame (See 11:7-10 and 12:13).

Paul further demonstrates his tact by evincing a confidence in the Corinthians which they hardly seem to have merited.

> For we write none other things unto you, than what ye read or acknowledge; and I trust ye shall acknowledge even to the end; as also ye have acknowledged us in part, that we are your rejoicing, even as ye also are our's in the day of the Lord Jesus. And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you. . . . Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for by faith ye stand. 1:13-15, 24

> I rejoice therefore that I have confidence in you in all things. 7:16

> For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you: for I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. . . . 9:1, 2

The third criterion of competence suggested by Thonssen and Baird is the possession of good taste. How does Paul stand in this regard? His sensitivity regarding "boasting" in his own behalf is an

indication of "good taste."

> Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly. . . . That which I speak, I speak it not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly, in this confidence of boasting. . . . I am become a fool in glorying. . . . 11:1, 17; 12:11

These words infer that it is odious to Paul to be compelled to defend in this way himself and his ministry. He does so in order to protect the flock at Corinth, that they might be able to vindicate him against those who despised him.

The delicacy of appeal found throughout this discourse is a further indication of good taste. Paul does not administer "sledge-hammer" blows of recrimination. He appeals to the highest affections, sympathy, love, and gratitude. Nowhere does he cater to what he would have called "the flesh."

Does Paul "reveal a broad familiarity with the interests of the day?" If by "interests of the day" we mean national or international events, the answer must be "No." If, however, we understand this expression to mean whatever things held most interest for his listeners, then the answer must be otherwise. Paul shows an amazing familiarity with the precise charges against him which are agitating the minds of those whom he addresses. He specifically alludes to almost twenty of these. Furthermore he applies his message so as to answer other questions of interest to this church. He discusses his next visit to them, and gives counsel regarding matters of immediate duty such as the collection for the poor believers of Judea. The news of his own experiences since last he wrote to them is also passed on. Throughout the epistle, Paul reveals an intimate knowledge of the ways of God, and of the significance of the gospel. Thus his competence in matters of eternal interest as well as in ephemeral affairs is indicated.

Finally, we would ask in this discussion of Paul's competence, "does he show by the way in which he handles speech materials that he is possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom?" Probably the section describing the development of ideas offers the best answer to the present question. There we noted that Paul chose major arguments easily supported from the experiences of himself and the Corinthians, and substantiated by Scripture. He reasoned deductively from premises that the Corinthians already accepted on the basis of the sacred writings of revelation. As Christ, the chosen of God, had followed a career marked by suffering as well as by power, so had Paul. As Christ had demonstrated by an upright, open life His holy character, so had Paul. As those who had accepted the preaching of Christ were convinced that He came from God, so should the Corinthians, who had experienced transformation of life through the gospel brought by Paul, acknowledge him as a messenger of the Almighty.

The third constituent of ethical proof is evidence of the good-will of the speaker.

> Finally, a speaker's good will generally is revealed through his ability (1) to capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience; (2) to identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems; (3) to proceed with candor and straightforwardness; (4) to offer necessary rebukes with tact and consideration; (5) to offset any personal reasons he may have for giving the speech; and (6) to reveal, without guile or exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth.[1]

To consider each of these criteria in detail would be to repeat much of what has already been said. However, some applications at least should be made demonstrating Paul's revelation of good-will towards his hearers. At the very beginning of his discourse he rejoices

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 387.

that his own sufferings will ultimately result in furthering the "consolation and salvation" of the Corinthians (1:6). When in the next chapter he explains why he has not yet visited Corinth for the second time, he uses words of love and affection to demonstrate that his decision was made for their benefit.

> For I made up my mind not to make you another painful visit. For if I cause you pain, who is there to make me glad but the one whom I have pained? And I wrote as I did, so that when I came I might not be pained by those who should have made me rejoice, for I felt sure of all of you, that my joy would be the joy of you all. For I wrote you out of much affliction and anguish of heart and with many tears, not to cause you pain but to let you know the abundant love that I have for you. 2:1-4 RSV

In the third chapter he declares that they are written on his heart in such a way that all men can perceive his love for them.

> Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men. 3:2

The spontaneous outburst of affection in 6:11, 12, where the Apostle declares that his heart is enlarged to receive them all, is as revelatory of his good will as is also the declaration towards the close of the letter when he states his readiness to "spend and be spent" for them although it seemed that the more abundantly he loved, the less return of affection he received (12:15).

It should perhaps be emphasized again that we consider that the manner and nature of the development of ideas in this letter to constitute the primary ethical proof of the discourse, rather than mere side expressions or allusions. Ethical proof is inherent in the warp and woof of this address, and only the reading of the whole can imply the total impression probably made upon the Corinthians by this apologetic from the founder of their church. We would suggest that this total impression did not have reference so much to doctrine or duty as to the character and authority of the Apostle Paul.

Analysis of Arrangement

This epistle is the least systematic of all the letters of Paul. The theme of vindicating his apostolic ministry is clearly defined, but it is impossible to formulate an outline of orderly sequential thought from these chapters. So much is this the case that many critics have gone so far as to suggest that we have here the remnants of more than one letter placed together for convenience. However as one well-known commentator has remarked:

> Even if the connection between the different parts of our Epistle were more indistinct, and the transitions from the one to the other were much more abrupt than they actually are. . . . they ought to awaken no surprise in an Epistle [composed in the midst of a journey, under overwhelming cares and circumstances of extraordinary vicissitude, by a writer of more than common sympathies, and with reference to classes of persons so different as were the sincere but erring brethren at Corinth and their corrupt and schismatical seducers. And yet, notwithstanding the varieties of subject and tone which are found in our Epistle, the whole is pervaded by a single purpose and spirit, the object of which was to heal the divisions which had commenced and threatened such serious consequences in the church, and to establish believers there in their former confidence in Paul. We discover nothing but the various actings of the same mind in its necessary changes, while contemplating what it loves and what it abhors; and the very fact that some passages in our Epistle have been fitted into their connections with so little an appearance of design, indicates that they were the natural outpouring of a spontaneous but conflicting emotion.][1]

This last line gives us the reason for the apparent lack of orderly development in this discourse. There is indeed a very evident unity to be found, but it is a unity of feeling and tone and purpose. It is not a unity of categories or divisions inasmuch as the letter was dictated from one in a storm of emotion. The news brought by Titus concerning the reformation of the greater number at Corinth, and the upsetting

---

[1]Kling in Lange's Commentary, Vol. 21, pp. 2, 3.

tidings of the accusations of the schismatic Judaizing teachers had stirred Paul to his depths.

> Joy, affection, tenderness, fiery indignation, self-vindication, profound thoughts as to the mysteries of the kingdom of God which flashed upon his soul as he spoke--all these elements were there, craving to find expression. They hindered any formal plan and method in the structure of the Epistle. They led to episodes, and side-glances, and allusive references without number.[1]

Despite the impossibility of tracing with some regularity the connections between the manifold ideas of this Epistle there are three obvious divisions.

1. The description of the Christian ministry. Chs 1-7
2. The admonition regarding the collection for the believers in Judea. Chs 8-9
3. The vindication of Paul's apostolic authority. Chs 10-13

Regarding the introduction, we find that it fulfills the main purposes of this part of a discourse. It seeks to enlist the attention and interest, and it aims at predisposing the audience favourably towards the one who addresses them. By his immediate reference to the tumult at Ephesus, and the providential purpose in that event, Paul probably obtained at once the attention, interest, and favour of the believers at Corinth. The conclusion does not follow the classical mode; but as we consider the closing chapter, we find that it accomplishes the following purposes which are not inappropriate.

1. The theme of the whole is reiterated. ("Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me. . . ." v 3)
2. The emotions of the Corinthians are aroused by a sudden reversal of thought as Paul warns them to examine themselves to see whether they are "in the faith." (v 5)

---

[1]Plumptre , in Ellicott, Vol. VII

3. It makes further references to Paul's love for them.(vs 9, 10)
4. Additional exhortation regarding genuine Christian conduct is given. (v 11)
5. Benediction. (v 14)

Style

While Paul's style is considered in a separate chapter, the following quotations are applicable concerning his particular style in this letter.

> The excitement and interchange of the affections, and probably also the haste under which Paul wrote the Epistle, certainly render the expressions often obscure and the constructions difficult; but they serve only to exalt our admiration of the great oratorical delicacy, art and power with which this outpouring of Paul's spirit, especially interesting as a self-defence, flows and streams onward, till its billows finally overflow the whole opposition of his adversaries.[1]

> . . . the difficulty of grasping the precise mind of this divine rhetorician far exceeds that which is felt in comprehending that of ordinary poets and orators; that he is so full of turns and delicate allusions, that one is constantly at a loss to know what he is doing, whither he is driving, and what he is opposing. So skilful are his arts that you can hardly believe he is at different times the same man. Now he boils up like a limpid spring, suddenly he rolls away with a great noise like a mighty torrent bearing all before it, and then he flows gently along, or expands like a placid lake over all the land. Sometimes he quite loses himself as it were in the sand, but all at once he breaks out at some unexpected point.[2]

Results

Concerning the reception of Paul's message we have no detailed knowledge. In some passages of the New Testament written at a later

---

[1]Meyer cited by Kling, Lange's Commentary, Vol. 21, p. 5.

[2]Erasmus cited by Kling, ibid.

date, however, we have indications that the second epistle to the Corinthians met with favourable results.

Writing to the Romans a few months later, Paul declared:

> For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.
> Rom 15:26, 27

Here is a direct reference to the successful fulfillment of the project suggested by Paul in the eighth and ninth chapters of 2nd Corinthians. Writing a little later, Paul can twice declare that the believers at Achaia (the Corinthians) have been pleased to make their contribution.

Also from Romans we learn that one of the most prominent members of the Corinthian church was host to Paul at the time he wrote this later letter.

> Gaius mine host, and of the whole church, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain of the city saluteth you, and Quartus a brother. Rom 16:23

Apparently Gaius, who had at one time or another exercised hospitality towards most of the Corinthian believers, had reflected to the Apostle the love of the entire church. In this verse also the greetings of other Corinthians are passed on to the Roman church, including a greeting from one who held an official position at Corinth, and who later became a fellow minister of Paul's.

In the record of Acts we read of Paul's visit to Corinth after the despatch of the second letter, and we learn that he stayed with the believers for three months. There is no hint of discord, but there is a reference which indicates that the Apostle so shared the confidence of the church that it did not consider it necessary to choose delegates of its own to watch over the appropriation of the funds they had contributed.

> . . . he came unto Greece, and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria, he purposed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Asia Sopater of Berea; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus.
>
> Acts 20:2-4

From this reference it would seem that it was only the threat from Jews of the synagogue which caused Paul to leave the Corinthians on this occasion. While delegates from the other contributing churches are mentioned as accompanying him, apparently the Corinthians did not consider it necessary to have one of their own number share the guardianship of the funds.

It may also be significant that after his first imprisonment Paul again visited Corinth. 2 Tim 4:20 makes reference to the fact that a native Corinthian Erastus (referred to in Rom 16:23) remained in the city at that time because of illness. These later visits mentioned in Acts and 2 Timothy suggest a probable restoration of harmony between the Apostle and the church at Corinth.

The commentator Plummer sums up the evidence in the following words:

> As to the results of these appeals and exhortations we have no direct evidence; but we may infer that they were in the main successful. The Epistle to the Romans, written from Corinth a few months later, seems to have been composed in a tranquil atmosphere; and if the Church of Corinth had again given serious trouble to S. Paul we should probably have some traces of the disaffection either in Romans or in other writings. When Clement of Rome wrote to the Church of Corinth c. A.D. 95 he has to criticize some failings, but nothing so grave as a rejection of apostolic teaching. Hegesippus (c. A.D. 160) found it continuing in the faith, and says that he and they were mutually refreshed in the true doctrine (Eus H.E. IV xxii. 1, 2). A little later the letters of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, were so valued that heretics thought it worth their while to garble them (Eus. H.E. IV. xxiii. 12).

---

[1]Plummer, Cambridge Bible, xxi, xxii.

V. THE DISCOURSE TO THE GALATIANS

Written with no thought that it would become scripture to be read for thousands of years, this short letter speaks to the supreme need of all men in all times.[1]

The Epistle to the Galatians

. . . If we would understand Galatians aright, we must think of it, not primarily as a theological treatise, but as the passionate outpouring of the apostle's soul in vindication of the gospel which he has been commissioned to preach, and of the faith which has made all things new for himself.[2]

The Epistle is polemical, impetuous, and overpowering; and yet tender, affectionate and warning in tone. It strikes like lightning every projecting point that approaches its path, and yet undelayed by these zigzag deflexions, instantaneously attains the goal. Every verse breathes the spirit of the great and free Apostle of the Gentiles. His earnestness and mildness, his severity and love, his vehemence and tenderness, his depth and simplicity, his commanding authority and sincere humility, are here vividly brought before us in fresh and bold outlines.[3]

It was necessary that the particularism of Judaism, which exposed to the heathen world so repellent a demeanour, and such offensive claims should be uprooted, and the baselessness of its prejudices and pretensions fully exposed to the world's eye. This was the service which the Apostle achieved for mankind by his magnificent dialectic.[4]

In vehemence, effectiveness, and depth of conviction this Epistle is only paralleled by Luther's De Captivitate Babylonica, in which he realised his saying that his battle with the Papacy required "a tongue of which every word is a thunderbolt."[5]

---

[1]Raymond T. Stemm, "Galatians," Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 10, p. 429.

[2]George S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (Series, no volume numbers) The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934), p. xlvii.

[3]Schaff, Lange's Commentary, Vol. 22, p. 9.

[4]Baur, cited by Farrar, Messages, pp. 248-249.

[5]Farrar, Messages, p. 250.

> To the bigoted few, every one of these propositions would seem to be a startling and offensive paradox. It requires no small knowledge of history fully to realise the splendid originality, the superb courage, required for the enunciation of such opinions.[1]
>
> It [the epistle to the Galatians] was the manifesto of that spiritual reformation which was involved in the very idea of Christianity. More than any book which was ever written these few pages marked an epoch in history. . . . the words scrawled on those few sheets of papyrus were destined to wake echoes which have lived, and shall live for ever and for ever. Savonarola heard them and Wiclif [sic], and Huss, and Luther, and Tyndale, and Wesley. They were the Magna Charta of spiritual emancipation.[2]

One of the greatest of Pauline scholars, Dean Farrar, has asserted that " it requires much thought and study to feel the force and beauty of a letter of which almost every sentence is a thunderbolt, and of which every word, when one understands it, is alive."[3] Thus does this scholar refer to the address to the Galatians, an address which more than any other of Paul's letters reveals him as a great orator. Because this discourse is so evidently one whose intent is persuasion, and whose content springs from a specific emergency situation, it is futile to attempt criticism of it without an extensive study of its historical context.

The Occasion

The essence of the problem behind this letter is the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. Christianity had begun with a Jew, it had been proclaimed by Jewish apostles, and its adherents cherished the Jewish scriptures, and attended the Jewish synagogues. Was

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, p. 263.

[2]Ibid., p. 258.

[3]Ibid.

Christianity to be but another cult of Judaism? If so it would be restricted to the ghettos and probably would never become a world religion.

Did the early Christians have a clear vision of their universal work? Apparently not. After Luke has referred to the appearances of the risen Christ, he records this question of the disciples. "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Acts 1:6 The Apostles apparently still looked for a Jewish dominion of the world. Christ's reply to their question was: ". . . ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Acts 1:8

Here was a command for the prosecution of a world-wide work, but there was no clue as to whether this world-wide gospel was to be offered as from "the old wine-bottles" of Judaism, or whether the "new wine" of the gospel required also "new bottles" to contain it, (Matt 9:17). Was every convert from a pagan nation to be circumcised as a Jewish proselyte before being admitted to the love-feast of the Christians? Were the tenets of the ceremonial laws of the Torah binding upon believing Gentiles? Stalker aptly summarizes the problem in the following quotation.

> It had pleased God in the primitive times to choose the Jewish race from among the nations and make it the repository of salvation; and, till the advent of Christ, those from other nations who wished to become partakers of the true religion had to seek entrance as proselytes within the sacred enclosure of Israel. Having thus destined this race to be the guardians of revelation, God had to separate them very completely from all other nations and from all other aims which might have distracted their attention from the sacred trust which had been committed to them. For this purpose he regulated their whole life with rules and arrangements intended to make them a peculiar people, different

from all other races of the earth. Every detail of their life--their forms of worship, their social customs, their dress, their food--was prescribed for them; and all these prescriptions were embodied in that vast legal instrument which they called the law. The rigorous prescription of so many things which are naturally left to free choice was a heavy yoke upon the chosen people; it was a severe discipline to the conscience, and such it was felt to be by the more earnest spirits of the nation.

But others saw in it a badge of pride; it made them feel that they were the select of the earth and superior to all other people; and, instead of groaning under the yoke, as they would have done if their consciences had been very tender, they multiplied the distinctions of the Jew, swelling the volume of the prescriptions of the law with stereotyped customs of their own. To be a Jew appeared to them the mark of belonging to the aristocracy of the nations; to be admitted to the privileges of this position was in their eyes the greatest honor which could be conferred on one who did not belong to the commonwealth of Israel. Their thoughts were all pent within the circle of this national conceit. Even their hopes about the Messiah were colored with these prejudices; they expected Him to be the hero of their own nation, and the extension of His kingdom they conceived as a crowding of the other nations within the circle of their own through the gateway of circumcision. They expected that all the converts of the Messiah would undergo this national rite and adopt the life prescribed in the Jewish law and tradition; in short, their conception of Messiah's reign was a world of Jews.

Such undoubtedly was the tenor of popular sentiment in Palestine when Christ came; and multitudes of those who accepted Jesus as the Messiah and entered the Christian Church had this set of conceptions as their intellectual horizon. They had become Christians, but they had not ceased to be Jews; they still attended the temple worship; they prayed at the stated hours, they fasted on the stated days, they dressed in the style of the Jewish ritual; they would have thought themselves defiled by eating with uncircumcised Gentiles; and they had no thought but that, if Gentiles became Christians, they would be circumcised and adopt the style and customs of the Jewish nation.[1]

---

[1]Stalker, pp. 115-116.

The record of the early chapters of Acts describes the preaching of the gospel in the places, and in the order, predicted by Christ. First the preaching was at Jerusalem, then through all Judea, and next in Samaria. But in the tenth chapter of this book we find a Gentile, a Roman, knocking at the door of Peter, and asking for admission to the Church. Immediately prior to the arrival of the Roman Cornelius, we are told that Peter was given a vision to instruct him that he should "not call any man common or unclean" Acts 10:28. This apparently had the effect upon Peter of sufficiently relieving him of his Jewish prejudices as to enable him to receive this Gentile into Christian fellowship. Dean Farrar suggests some of the thoughts in the mind of Peter as he contemplated this issue of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church. We quote at some length because this is a clear presentation of the reasoning behind the conclusions expressed by Paul in the epistle to the Galatians.

> For if Christ had said that He came to fulfil the Law, had He not also said many things which showed that those words had a deeper meaning than the prima facie application which might be attached to them? Had He not six times vindicated for the Sabbath a larger freedom than the scribes admitted? Had He not poured something like contempt on needless ceremonial ablutions? Had He not Himself abstained from going up thrice yearly to Jerusalem to the three great festivals? Had He not both by word and action, showed His light estimation of mere ceremonial defilement, to which the Law attached a deep importance? Had He not even gone so far as to say that Moses had conceded some things which were in themselves undesirable, only because of the hardness of Jewish hearts? Had He not said, "The Law and the Prophets were UNTIL JOHN?"
>
> And, besides all this, was it not clear that He meant His Church to be an Universal Church? Was not this universality of the offered message of mercy and adoption clearly indicated in the language of the Old Testament? Had not the Prophets again and again implied the ultimate calling of the Gentiles? But if the Gentiles were to be admitted into the number of saints and brethren; if, as Jesus Himself had prophesied, there was to

be at last one flock and one Shepherd, how could this be if the Mosaic Law was to be considered as of permanent and universal validity? Was it not certain that the Gentiles, as a body, never would accept the whole system of Mosaism, and never would accept, above all, the crucial ordinance of circumcision? Would not such a demand upon them be a certain way of ensuring the refusal of the Gospel message? Or, if they did embrace it, was it conceivable that the Gentiles were never to be anything but mere Proselytes of the Gate, thrust as it were outside the portals of the True Spiritual Temple? If so, were not the most primary conceptions of Christianity cut away at the very roots? were not its most beautiful and essential institutions rendered impossible? How could there be love-feasts, how could there be celebrations of the Lord's Supper, how could there be the beautiful spectacle of Christian love and Christian unity, if the Church was to be composed, not of members joined together in equal brotherhood, but of a proletariate of tolerated Gentiles, excluded even from the privilege of eating with an aristocracy of superior Jews? Dim and dwarfed and maimed did such an ideal look beside the grand conception of the redeemed nations of the world coming to Sion, singing, and with everlasting joy upon their heads!

And behind all these uncertainties towered a yet vaster and more eternal question. Christ had died to take away the sins of the world; what need, then, could there be of sacrifices? What significance could there be any more in the shadow, when the substance had been granted? Where was the meaning of types, after they had been fulfilled in the glorious Antitype? What use was left for the lamp of the Tabernacle when the Sun of Righteousness had risen with healing in His wings? [1]

Not all leaders of the infant Church saw the issue as clearly as Peter and Paul. We read that:

> . . . the apostles and brethren that were in Judaea heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them. Acts 11:1-3

Peter related to his critics the vision of the sheet full of clean and unclean beasts, whereby he had been made to understand that the

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, pp. 150-151.

Christian Church was to contain circumcised and uncircumcised alike. He recounted the story of the visit of Cornelius with its denouement of the receiving by the Gentiles of the gift of tongues.

> Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?
>
> When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life. Acts 11:17, 18

Nevertheless we read also in the very next verse that:

> . . . they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only. Acts 11:19

Evidently, the prejudices of the believers regarding the Gentiles were not to be easily dispersed.

It is at this stage that the persecutor Saul becomes Paul "the apostle born out of due time." 1 Cor 15:8 The Lord describes him as "a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles." Acts 9:15 Shortly after Peter's experience with Cornelius, Paul began his apostolic work at Antioch, and soon afterwards set off with Barnabas upon the first missionary expedition into the Gentile world. Wherever they preached, Paul and Barnabas accepted pagans into the Christian Church without requiring circumcision or obedience to the precepts of the Jewish ceremonial law.

> . . . as a man who knew the world and whose heart was set on winning the Gentile nations to Christ, he [Paul] felt far more strongly than did the Jews of Jerusalem, with their provincial horizon, how fatal such conditions as they meant to impose would be to the success of Christianity outside Judaea. The proud Romans, the highminded Greeks, would never have consented to be circumcised and to cramp their life within the narrow limits of Jewish tradition; a religion hampered with such conditions could never have become the universal religion.[1]

---

[1]Stalker, p. 118.

Paul and Barnabas were not to go unchallenged. Upon returning to Antioch after their first missionary tour, they found that Jewish Christians from Jerusalem had come down to Antioch declaring to the Gentile converts that without circumcision they could not hope for salvation. Thus we have in the heart of the book of Acts the record of group-discussion regarding this issue among the early Christian leaders at the famous Council of Jerusalem. The Scriptural account aptly reflects the tense atmosphere with its opposite elements of Jewish provincialism and Christian Catholicism. This passage, more than any other in the New Testament, casts light upon the ideological and historical background of the letter to the Galatians.

> And certain men which came down from Judaea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question. And being brought on their way by the church, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them. But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.
>
> And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they.

> Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them.
>
> And after they had held their peace, James answered saying. Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day.
>
> Acts 15:1-21

This decision of the Council was in harmony with Paul's own practice. The Gentiles were not to comply with the Jewish law of circumcision, but it was advised that they abstain from foods offered to idols. The reason for the latter probably was the common association of licentiousness with the feasts which involved the use of foods that had been presented to idols in heathen worship.

So deep-rooted, however, were the Jewish prejudices that not even this decision of the Jerusalem council put an end to the dispute.

> Nor did the opposition soon die down. On the contrary, it waxed stronger and stronger. It was fed from abundant sources. Fierce national pride and prejudice sustained it; probably it was nourished by self-interest, because the Jewish Christians would live on easier terms with the non-Christian Jews the less the difference between them was understood to be; religious conviction, rapidly warming into fanaticism, strengthened it; and very soon it was reinforced by all the rancor of hatred and the zeal of propagandism. For to such a height did this opposition rise that the party which was inflamed with it at length resolved to send out propagandists to visit the Gentile

> churches one by one and, in contradiction to the official apostolic rescript, warn them that they were imperilling their souls by omitting circumcision, and could not enjoy the privileges of true Christianity unless they kept the Jewish law.
>
> For years and years these emissaries of a narrow-minded fanaticism, which believed itself to be the only genuine Christianity, diffused themselves over all the churches founded by Paul throughout the Gentile world. Their work was not to found churches of their own; they had none of the original pioneer ability of their great rival. Their business was to steal into the Christian communities he had founded and win them to their own narrow views. They haunted Paul's steps wherever he went, and for many years were a cause to him of unspeakable pain. They whispered to his converts that his version of the gospel was not the true one, and that his authority was not to be trusted. Was he one of the twelve apostles? Had he kept company with Christ? They represented themselves as having brought the true form of Christianity from Jerusalem, the sacred headquarters; and they did not scruple to profess that they had been sent from the apostles there. They distorted the very noblest part of Paul's conduct to their purpose.[1]

Thus does Stalker picture for us the opposition to Paul's ministry, and the ideology which caused such outbursts as the vehement letter to the Galatians.

However, we would be in error if we assumed that this was the only issue before Paul in his message to the Galatians. There is a related issue, contingent upon the question of the relationship of Christianity to Judaism but transcending it in importance. To Paul's mind, the basic problem of humanity had to do with relationship to God. How could a man be at peace with the God he had offended by sin? How could righteousness be obtained? What was the path to peace of heart and mind? Just what was the nature of true religion? Did religion consist of external observances or a change of heart and disposition? Was justification to be found by ritual of form or revival of spirit?

---

[1]Stalker, pp. 120-121.

Was a man saved as a result of his own works, or as a result of accepting God's work for him? How could the Galatians be convinced that their own works could never earn God's free gift? Every reader of the New Testament knows Paul's answer to these questions. If there is one phrase in the Scriptures more Pauline than any other it is "righteousness by faith." The doctrinal epistles have as their basic theme "the just shall live by faith." Rom 1:16

Dean Farrar expresses what he believes to be Paul's concept of true religion in the following reference to the problem at Galatia.

> Religion is a broad, deep, free, bright, loving, universal spirit: broad as the path of God's commandments, deep as the ocean of His love, free as His common air, bright as His impartial sunshine, loving as His all-embracing mercy, universal as His omnipotent rule. For the centre, and head, and heart of Christianity is Christ, and there was nothing narrow, nothing scholastic, nothing jealously exclusive, in Christ. But, in the craft and subtlety of the devil and man, Religion has ever tended to wither away into Judaism, into Rabbinism, into scholasticism, into ecclesiasticism, . . . into dead schemes of dogmatic belief, into dead routines of elaborate ceremonial, into dead exclusiveness of party narrowness, into dead theories of scriptural inspiration, into dead formulae of Church parties, into the dead performance of dead works, or the dead assent to dead phrases. Now it was just this fatal tendency of human supineness against which Paul had to contend. Judaic Christians--apparently one man in particular--had come from Jerusalem to his fickle and ignorant Galations with the hard, ready-made Biblical dogma "Unless ye be circumcised, and keep the whole law, ye cannot be saved." They wanted to substitute external badges for inward faith; legal bondage for Christian freedom; observance of practices for holiness of heart. They were striving to put the new, rich, fermenting wine of Christianity into their old and bursten[sic] wine-skins of Levitism. In their hands, Christianity would have decayed into exclusiveness, self-congratulation, contempt of others, insistence upon the outward, indifference to the essential--a Christianity of the outward platter, a Christianity of the whitened grave.[1] (Emphasis ours)

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, pp. 255-256.

Duncan concurs with the viewpoint expressed by Farrar and at the same time affirms that this letter is not primarily a theological treatise but a persuasive appeal from a challenged apostle.

> The Epistle to the Galatians is not a theological treatise; it is a religious appeal. Yet behind that appeal there lies a definite outlook on life and destiny, an ordered system of thought on the purposes and activities of God as these have been revealed in Christ. Paul could not have pled as he does in Galatians if he had not had a clear theology.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . in two important respects his doctrine of justification differs from that of the Judaizers with whom he is in opposition. In the first place he insists that man can never win acceptance by the due performance of the divine requirements--the transcendent holiness of God and the depravity and servitude of man combine to make that way of acceptance impossible. Man cannot be justified by his own works but simply by faith in God. In the second place acceptance need not be postponed till that final day when we stand before Christ for judgment: man may be justified here and now, so soon as he turns to God in faith and flings himself on God's mercy.[1]

These, then, are the two basic issues in the letter to the Galatians, the difference between Christianity and Judaism, and the nature of genuine religion. The next problem, that of identifying the specific audience to whom the letter was addressed, is not as clear-cut.

The Audience

Who were the Galatians of this epistle? The term Galatia held two different meanings in the days of Paul. Primarily the significance of the word was an ethnological one referring to the section of Asia Minor between the rivers Sangarius and Halys, and which was peopled mainly by the Celtic tribes. Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, in the third century B. C. had invited this warlike people to come from Europe to

---

[1]Duncan, pp. xxxiv-xliii.

Asia. They accepted the invitation, and for a period they fought the battles of Nicomedes receiving from him a large strip of territory in return. Not content with this, the Celts terrorised Asia Minor as far as the Taurus mountains until confined to the original allotment of country by the victories of the Kings of Pergames, particularly Attalus I between 240 and 230 B.C.

> When Rome spread her conquests eastwards, this wild people retained the status of a dependent kingdom (189 B.C.); a century and a half later the country passed into various hands, and ultimately in 25 B.C. came to be governed under the Roman provincial system. At the time of Paul the province which went under the name of Galatia included the old kingdom of Galatia to the north, and also parts of Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Phrygia which adjoined it to the south.[1]

Thus the second meaning for Galatia referred to the new Roman province. Which of these meanings does Paul use when he speaks of the "foolish Galatians" (Gal 3:1)? Was he writing to the descendents of the Celtic tribes in the north of Asia Minor, or was he addressing the churches of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe located in the south, and included in the Roman privince of Galatia?

Each of the alternative hypotheses, called the North Galatian and the South Galatian theories respectively, has weighty scholarly support. It is generally believed that the theories are mutually exclusive, inasmuch as statements in the epistle suggest that the churches addressed were founded at one and the same time. Either the churches are those founded on the first missionary journey in South Galatia, or they belonged to North Galatia and were established on the second journey of Paul.

The early Church Fathers and the mediaeval scholars believed that Paul was addressing the churches in North Galatia. Since the end

---

[1]Ibid., pp. xviii-xix.

of the eighteenth century, however, there have arisen many scholars expressing the South Galatian view. Lightfoot, Chase, Schmiedel, Moffatt, Neander, Conybeare and Howson, Farrar, Godet, Mommsen, Meyer, Alford, and Findlay appear among the famous names linked with the former view, while Ramsay, Rendall, Woodhouse, Zahn, Clemen, Weiss, and Lake support the latter.

There is a strong temptation for modern commentators to accept the South Galatian view because it provides an account of the origin of churches as described in the record of the first missionary tour. If, however, this view is rejected, we have no details whatever as to the founding of the Galatian churches, except that it took place probably on the second missionary journey.

Farrar asserts:

> It may be regarded as certain that by "Galatians" St Paul meant the inhabitants of Galatia proper (the Trocmi, Tectosages, Tolistoboii, with their three capital towns of Tavium, Pessinus, and Ancyra). To speak of the Neo-Galatians of the Roman province, which included Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe as Galatians, would be like writing a letter "to the Prussians," which was specially intended for the people of Schleswig-Holstein, or Alsace and Lorraine. St. Luke never dreams of calling Pisidia and Lycaonia by the name Galatia (Acts xiv. 6, 11).[1]

Burton, however, declares:

> In view of all the extant evidence we conclude that the balance of probability is in favour of the South-Galatian view.[1]

To discuss the evidence for and against either position would require a volume of large proportions, and inasmuch as scholars have not come to unanimity on the matter, it would be presumptuous to

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, p. 247.

[2]Ernest DeWitt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, Vol. 35 of The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1948), p. xliv.

assert here a dogmatic choice. We are comforted, however, by the apposite remark of Burton to the effect that this issue is subsidiary to other issues which are more easily settled.

> It is fortunate for the interpreter to the letter to the Galatians that while the location of the churches is in dispute and the time and place of writing can be determined, if at all, only by a balance of probabilities resting on indirect evidence, the question for whose answer these matters are of chief importance, can be decided with a good degree of certainty and on independent grounds. The previous relations of the writer and his readers, the circumstances that led to the writing of the letter, the purpose for which it was written, these appear with great clearness in the letter itself.[1]

It should be noted that, as the above quotation implies, the indefinite state of our knowledge regarding the exact definition of the letter also affects our search for the time and place of origin of this epistle. Those who hold the North Galatian view believe that Paul dictated the message about 57-58 A.D. probably from the city of Corinth. The exponents of the alternative view believe the letter was written about ten years earlier, perhaps from Ephesus.

Regarding the particular auditors of this address and the date the message was composed we would suggest in summary the following.

1. The audience was located either in North Galatia or in the cities of Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium south of this area. It is impossible to dogmatize regarding the priority of either region.
2. The message was composed by Paul sometime between A.D. 47 and A.D. 58.
3. Despite our lack of certainty regarding the geographical location of the Galatians, their essential characteristics and background are clearly indicated by the letter addressed

---

[1]Burton, p. liii.

> to them. Thus we have in the epistle itself sufficient material to reconstruct, for purposes of rhetorical criticism, the main lineaments of Paul's auditors.

We next inquire concerning what can be gleaned from the epistle itself regarding the Galatians, their initial receipt of the gospel, and their later defection.

The Galatians had been converted from heathenism, not from Jewry. This is apparent from Paul's declaration that formerly they had done service "unto them which by nature are no gods" Gal 4:8. When Paul first ministered to them, the Galatians received him with tremendous enthusiasm. They proved sympathetic towards Paul at a time of illness on his part. The gospel had been presented in Christocentric form, with emphasis laid upon transformation of heart and life, as the result of genuine Christian faith. On no occasion had the Apostle urged circumcision or any other requirement of the ceremonial law upon his hearers. They had been baptized, and received the seal of spiritual gifts. Witnessing miracles in their midst, the Galatians believed positively that the true God had spoken to them through the gospel presented by Paul. The following verses from the letter make reference to the early experience of these believers, and their relationship to Paul and the substance of his preaching.

> Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first. And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. Where is then the blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me. 4:13-15

> Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. . . . For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love. Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. 5:1-8

> O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? 3:1-3

Thus Paul refers to the initial attitude of these believers, and also the later backsliding.

Not long before the writing of this letter, members of the Judaizing party in the Christian Church had visited the Galatian churches. Despite the prevailing Christian opinion expressed at the Council of Jerusalem concerning the freedom of the Gentiles from the ceremonial laws of Judaism, these Judaizers began to urge circumcision and its accompaniments upon the new believers. The stress was legalistic as well as Judaistic. It was taught that salvation was dependent upon certain outward observances. Judging from the trend of Paul's rebuttal, the new teachers claimed that salvation was possible only to those who were the descendents of Abraham by birth, or through adoption. Inasmuch as circumcision was the rite committed to Abraham to distinguish the "elect" from the world, its performance was obligatory upon every proselyte. The Galatians must submit to this initiatory rite. Furthermore they should observe the Jewish feast days. (See 1:9, 3:7, 9, 14; 4:21-31; 4:10). Such were the claims of the Jewish schismatics.

Besides these doctrinal features of the message of the Judaizers, there was also the personal element of opposition to Paul.

> The letter itself furnishes evidence, which is confirmed by 1 and 2 Corinthians, that the apostolic office or function was clearly recognized as one of great importance in the Christian community, and that the question who could legitimately claim it was one on which there was sharp difference of opinion. An apostle was much more than a local elder or itinerant missionary. He was a divinely commissioned founder of Christian

> churches, indeed, more, of the Christian church oecumenical. With their effort to keep the Christian movement within the Jewish church, including proselytes from other religions, the judaisers naturally associated the contention that the apostolate was limited to those who were appointed by Jesus or by those whom he appointed. With their denial of the distinctive doctrines of Paul they associated a denial of his right to teach them as an apostle. This denial seems to have taken the form of representing Paul as a renegade follower of the Twelve, a man who knew nothing of Christianity except what he had learned from the Twelve, and preached this in a perverted form. This appears from the nature of Paul's defence of his independent authority as an apostle in the first two chapters of the letter, and indicate that with their theory of a limited apostolate the judaisers had associated the claim that the apostolic commission must proceed from the circle of the original Twelve. . . .
>
> This double attack of the judaisers upon the apostle and his doctrine and the attempt to convert the Galatians to their view was upon the point of succeeding when Paul learned of the state of affairs.[1]

Because of the twofold nature of the attack upon the believers in Galatia, it seems apparent that Paul had a double purpose in his discourse to them. He was forced to defend himself as well as his doctrine. In fact, it would be impossible adequately to defend the latter without doing the former. He must support his claim to an equality with the Twelve. Secondly he evidently decided to answer the Judaizers by demonstrating the true nature of the Christian faith, showing it to be the heir of Judaism, but transcendent and now independent of it. Judging from the content of the discourse, Paul hoped to reaffirm what is to him the heart of the gospel, justification by faith. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." 5:6 The rite of circumcision Paul does not consider evil in itself. It is because his opponents would make of outward observances the heart of the gospel, rather than faith in

---

[1]Burton, pp. liv-lv.

Christ, that the Apostle is stirred to his depths. Christ to him is ever the primary emphasis and must take second place to no other phase of doctrine.

Analysis of the Development of Ideas, with Emphasis Upon Logos

> Rhetorical adaptation can be dealt with usefully only at the level of ideas, and not at the level of techniques abstracted from their ideational context. If the rhetorical critic were to analyze, report, and interpret ideas, using rhetorical forms as instruments, then valuable historical understandings might be contributed.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Human values can be talked about only as constellations of attitudes moving through qualitative changes in historical continuity. The effort to comprehend this "history of ideas" is at the center of speech criticism, for rhetorical adaptation can be understood only on the basis of an adequate historical perspective on these germinal values.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . rhetorical evaluation will attempt to discover the following things: (1) the basic values on which the speaker rests his specific proposals; (2) the specific proposals themselves; (3) the manner in which the speaker attempts to connect values with proposals in the minds of his audience; (4) the extent to which these connections were appropriate to the audience being addressed. These various "connections" are not simply "logical appeals"; the connections will be established . . . by virtue of all kinds of appeal in the speech.[1] (Emphasis ours)

As will be pointed out under the heading "Arrangement" this letter has three easily discernible divisions. The first two chapters are personal in content, the next two are doctrinal, and the last two consist of practical application of the foregoing.

---

[1]Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech Vol. XLII (Oct, 1956), pp. 287-289.

The Key Ideas of This Address

Running through all three divisions is the keynote of "liberty." This emphasis upon freedom is found in at least eleven places in the discourse, "more often than in all the other Epistles put together."[1] Let us consider some of the key references in the order of their appearing.

> Fourteen years later, I went up to Jerusalem again, this time with Barnabas, and we took Titus with us. My visit on this occasion was by divine command, and I gave a full exposition of the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles. I did this first in private conference with the Church leaders, to make sure that what I had done and proposed doing was acceptable to them. Not one of them intimated that Titus, because he was a Greek, ought to be circumcised. In fact, the suggestion would never have arisen but for the presence of some pseudo-Christians, who wormed their way into our meeting to spy on the liberty we enjoy in Christ Jesus, and then attempted to tie us up with rules and regulations. We did not give those men an inch, for the truth of the Gospel for you and all Gentiles was at stake. Gal 2:1-5 Phillips translation.

Thus in this first section of the discourse Paul strikes the chord that he plans to make resound over and over again. He refers to his attendance at what was probably the same council as is described in Act 15 and to which previous reference has been made. On that occasion Titus, a Gentile convert, had accompanied him. The Judaizing element had brought pressure to bear that Titus might be circumcised, but Paul refused to compromise his usual practice. Inasmuch as he nowhere urged Gentile converts to subscribe to the Jewish law, it would have been inconsistent indeed to have permitted Titus to be circumcised. Furthermore, Paul reasons, none of the actual leaders of the Church urged the matter. It is significant that the Apostle describes the liberty of believers as a liberty "in Christ Jesus."

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, p. 253.

It is the liberty of one who has become God's bond servant, and who is free from the bondage of human prescriptions. Over forty times does the name "Christ" appear in this epistle, and almost every occasion shows it as minus the definite article, thus signifying the personal name rather than the title. Paul is declaring that because of what Christ has done by His life and death, believers are now possessors of spiritual freedom. This accords with the very first thought of the epistle after the greeting. "Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us. . . ." 1:3,4

The significance of the argument for the Galatians appears to be that they should have seen themselves represented in Titus. If it was not necessary for Titus to be circumcised even though he was an itinerant preacher of the gospel, then it could hardly be required of them either.

In the next chapter the same thought of liberty is expressed in a different context.

> Before the coming of faith we were all imprisoned under the power of the Law, with our only hope of deliverance the faith that was to be shown to us. Or, to change the metaphor, the Law was like a strict governess in charge of us until we went to the school of Christ and learned to be justified by faith in Him. Once we had that faith we were completely free from the governess's authority. For now that you have faith in Christ you are all sons of God. All of you who were baptised "into" Christ have put on the family likeness of Christ. Gone is the distinction between Jew and Greek, slave and free man, male and female--you are all one in Christ Jesus!
>
> Gal 3:23-28 Phillips

Paul, by the use of metaphor, first suggests that the Jewish Torah[1] was like a prison-house confining believers to its custody until

---

[1]The expression "the Law" can easily be misunderstood by 20th century readers. It is not a synonym for the Ten Commandment Law. The original Hebrew and Greek words for this expression are Torah,

the advent of the gospel faith. The Greek word which Phillips translates "governess" is paidagōgon and literally it means the slave whose work it was to conduct a child to school. Paul is saying that the office of Judaism was only to act as a prelude to the gospel. It was merely to introduce men to Christ, and then its duties were discharged. Once believers had been brought to Christ, they were no longer under the direction of Judaism. Christ Himself, through the Holy Spirit, became the Instructor. Once baptized into Christ the Christian was on terms of spiritual equality with every man, regardless of race or standing. Thus would Paul shatter the barriers between Jews and Gentiles. He believes all men are one in Christ, and urges the Galatians to assert their privileges. The application of these figures, and the reasoning coincident with them is not difficult to see. The Judaizing teachers had been affirming that the code committed to the Jews with its manifold regulations was permanent in authority.

---

and ónomos. "Torah" literally means "instruction" and thus to the Jew, the whole of God's revealed will was originally the Torah. From this early significance the term came to include the Jewish system itself, as a system based on the revealed will of Jehovah. By Paul's day a more comprehensive meaning still was prevalent among the Jews. The Torah came to signify the entire mass of Rabbinical lore surrounding the theme of religious duty. This included literally hundreds of precepts nowhere found in the Old Testament. Regarding the fourth commandment for example, we find that the Rabbis had devised approximately six hundred independent precepts to implement its observance. Thus what was primarily God's revealed will had become by the time of Paul what he aptly describes as "a yoke of bondage." Gal 5:1

> "The common reference of the term among the Jews was, of course, to the legislative system ascribed to Moses. This was par eminence ónomos. On the basis of this system Pharisaism had erected what at least tended to become a rigid external legalism, according to which God demanded obedience to statutes, and approved or disapproved men according as they rendered or failed to render such obedience. Ethical principles and motives were in large measure lost sight of. . . ." Burton, p. 447.

It was the building itself, not merely a scaffolding. Because of this, Gentiles must submit themselves as certainly as the natural sons of Abraham. But Paul rejects such concepts, and through easily comprehended illustrations he aimed to help the Galatians also to refuse the claims of Jewish domination. The Jewish Prayer Book of the day included the following thanksgiving: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast not made me a heathen. Blessed art Thou . . . who hast not made me a bondman. Blessed art Thou . . . who hast not made me a woman."[1] From such a spirit of narrow and proud exclusiveness the Galatians are to rejoice in their freedom.

This spirit of Paul is echoed by Luther's famous commentary on Galatians. Commenting on the above passage the Reformer exclaimed:

> If therefore ye look unto Christ and that which he hath done, there is now no law. For he, coming in the time appointed, verily took away the law. Now, since the law is gone, we are not kept under the tyranny thereof any more; but we live in joy and safety under Christ, who now so sweetly reigneth in us by his Spirit. Now where the Lord (reigneth) there is liberty. Wherefore, if we could perfectly apprehend Christ, which hath abolished the law by his death and hath reconciled us unto his Father, that schoolmaster should have no power over us at all.[2]

It is noticeable that this commentator so shares the thought of Paul as to use the identical emphasis regarding liberty. Similarly those who had been accustomed to the preaching of the Apostle such as the Galatians would probably have been quick to catch the refrain that recurs in this address.

The succeeding chapter continues the theme of liberty. Paul

---

[1]Duncan, p. 123.

[2]Martin Luther, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, Based on Lectures Delivered at the University of Wittenberg in the Year 1531 (London: James Clarke and Co.), pp. 336-337.

now illustrates the Christian's deliverance from the bondage of Jewish ritual and legalism by use of an allegory.

> It is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the slave and the other by the free woman. The child of the slave was born in the ordinary course of nature, but the child of the free woman was born in accordance with God's promise. This can be regarded as an allegory. Here are the two Agreements represented by the two women: the one from Mount Sinai bearing children into slavery, typified by Hagar (Mount Sinai being in Arabia, the land of the descendants of Ishmael, Hagar's son), and corresponding to present-day Jerusalem--for the Jews are still, spiritually speaking, "slaves." But the free woman typifies the heavenly Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all, and is spiritually "free." It is written
>
> > Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not:
> > Break forth and cry, thou that travailest not:
> > For more are the children of the desolate
> > Than of her which hath the husband.
>
> Now we, brothers, are like Isaac, for we are children born "by promise." But just as in those far-off days the natural son persecuted the "spiritual" son, so it is today. Yet what is the scriptural instruction?
>
> > Cast out the handmaid and her son:
> > For the son of the handmaid shall not inherit
> > With the son of the free woman.
>
> So then, my brothers, we are not to look upon ourselves as the sons of the slave woman but of the free, not sons of slavery under the Law but sons of freedom under grace. 4:22-31
>
> Phillips translation

As Westerners, we are inclined to regard with suspicion argument from allegory. However, as pointed out elsewhere in this dissertation, the Eastern mind was far more familiar with this mode of reasoning. It should also be emphasized that Paul was not discounting the historicity of the narrative to which he refers. He is affirming that the record has a double sense. In this he is consistent with the concepts expressed throughout the New Testament that Israel was a type of the Church. The belief of Christians since the time of Christ in this regard has been

as expressed in the following quotation.

> Jewish history and worship form one grand type. The Old Testament (as Augustine long ago remarked) is the New veiled, and the New Testament is the Old unveiled.
>
> The ancient Jewish people, for example, sustained to God the same relation as is now sustained by the Christian Church, and by each Christian. Their sufferings in Egypt, their deliverance under Moses, their wanderings in the desert, their entry into Canaan, prefigure important facts in the history of all Christians. The Israelites not only lived under the same authority with us, and were governed by an economy of discipline like our own, but the facts of their history were typical of the history of the Church. Ro 2:28; 1 Cor 10; Heb 4; 1 Pet 2:5-10; Rev 15:5[1]

Thus Paul takes a story found in the Scriptures possessed and esteemed by the Galatians, and applies it to their own situation.

The parallels he is drawing can be depicted as follows:

JEWISH CHURCH	CHRISTIAN CHURCH
The bondwoman, Hagar.	The freewoman, Sarah.
Son of the bondwoman, Ishmael.	Son of the freewoman, Isaac.
Natural birth (the flesh).	Supernatural birth (the promise).
Mount Sinai	Mount Zion
The Law	The Promise
The earthly Jerusalem	The heavenly Jerusalem
Enslaved	Free
Fruitful	Barren
Small offspring	Large offspring
Persecuting	Persecuted
Expulsion	Inheritance
The Jewish Church is enslaved.	The Christian Church is free.[2]

In effect Paul is declaring that the existing Jewish Church was in a similar position to God as Hagar and her son Ishmael were to Abraham. Hagar had been a slave and her son likewise. Ultimately both

---

[1]Joseph Angus, The Bible Handbook, Revised by Samuel G. Green, (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1952), pp. 226-227.

[2]W. Sanday, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 453.

were expelled from the household of Abraham after Ishmael had persecuted Isaac, the son of Abraham's true wife Sarah. Even so, Paul is saying, the present Jewish church, and the Judaizers who are endeavouring to seduce you--these have a wrong relationship with God. They are ever behaving like servants instead of as sons. They are striving by works to earn commendation and acceptance, rather than accepting the free love due from a father to his child. Furthermore, as Ishmael had persecuted Isaac, so do the Jews persecute the Christians, and the Judaizing teachers Paul.

True Christians are represented by Isaac. He was the child of promise miraculously born, unlike Ishmael who was born as a result of Abraham's own carnal effort to implement God's promise. Every Christian is miraculously "born again" through divine agencies and all human efforts cannot make a sinner a child of God. As Ishmael was the product of carnal[1] activity so the Jewish preoccupation with outward rites and ceremonies was evidence of their carnal, unrenewed hearts. The religion of the Judaizers is one of bondage, of slavery to constant striving after acceptance via human effort. In contrast the Christian religion as preached by Paul was one of freedom, whereby believers are freely accepted by God, not because of their works, but because of their relationship to Christ through faith. Such is the reasoning of the Apostle. As Duncan has pointed out "every word in this argument of Paul must have lashed his Judaizing opponents to indignation."[2] At the same time it was calculated to convict the Galatains of the truth of Paul's position, and the error of his opponents'.

We need only recall the eminent position granted by Jews and Christians today to Abraham to realize the appropriateness of Paul's

---

[1]Carnal is Paul's term for the opposite of "spiritual." It signifies the activity of the unregenerate person.

[2]Duncan, p. 145.

argument. The Galatians probably used concerning this Old Testament patriarch the phrase current in their day--"The Father of the Faithful" (Rom 4:16). Any reference to Abraham was likely to enlist their interest immediately. Furthermore the application made by Paul concerning the sons Ishmael and Isaac, as representing the old and new covenants respectively, could hardly fail to win the attention of the Galatians. Regularly they were participating in the Communion service which was symbolic of the "blood of the new covenant" shed on Calvary (Mt 26:28). The very high point of their faith was concerned with the new covenant of promise to which they had once been strangers. (Eph. 2:12, 13)

By his five-fold use of the word "free" in this passage Paul has endeavoured to show that true religion is the spontaneous service of "sons" rather than the enforcement of outward ritual and observances such as even slaves could fulfill. He has declared that the legal spirit of a servant is alien to the true motive of Christianity which is love. In the next section of his discourse he sums up the conclusions of the preceding arguments, and is careful to delineate the nature of the freedom to which the Galatians have been called.

> For freedom Christ has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery. Now I, Paul, say to you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you. I testify again to every man who receives circumcision that he is bound to keep the whole law. You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace. For through the Spirit, by faith, we wait for the hope of righteousness. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail, but faith working through love. You were running well; who hindered you from obeying the truth? This persuasion is not from him who called you. A little yeast leavens the whole lump. I have confidence in the Lord that you will take no other view than mine; and he who is troubling you will bear his judgment, whoever he is. But if I, brethren, still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted? In that case the stumblingblock of

> the cross has been removed. I wish those who unsettle you would mutilate themselves! For you were called to freedom, brethren; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself." 5:1-14 RSV

Paul's key thought of liberty occurs both at the commencement and the end of this passage. His tone has become more stern and authoritative. Believing that he has adequately defended his position, the Apostle here emphasizes the natural consequences of his doctrine. "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." v 2. It is noteworthy that he has not specifically mentioned circumcision in the preceding two chapters. Instead he has endeavoured to cut away the entire foundation upon which circumcision and similar issues rested. Confident now that he has shown the temporary nature of Judaism and its preparatory function, Paul feels free to urge the implications of these facts. If Judaism was a temporary institution, any reversion at this time to its elements would be a retrograde step, he affirms. Circumcision is no longer "profitable" as regards righteousness. Indeed, he says, you must choose between such ordinances of obsolete Judaism, and Christ. Each is exclusive of the other. He who has Christ does not now need the Torah of Israel to prescribe his daily conduct. He who follows the Torah as his guide thereby places himself outside of Christ. "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." v 3 This is relentless logic. If, says Paul, circumcision is so important as to be made the symbol and seal of Judaism, then its observance must imply that the observer holds himself subject to the ceremonial system in its entirety. If you are going to obey a rite nowhere enunciated by Christ or His apostles in the new Christian age, Paul tells his listeners, then just as logically you ought to go the whole way and submit to every requirement of the

Jewish code. Probably this thought had strong impact upon the Galatians, for it is not likely that they had considered all the implications of the Judaizing doctrine to which they had given ear. To observe the countless ceremonial washings, and the multitude of rabbinical precepts regarding the minutia of life, which had been imposed by the Jewish leaders upon the original Mosaic law would have proved a "yoke of bondage" indeed.

"For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." vs 5,6 Twice the word "faith" is used in contrast to the thought of ceremonial works in the preceding verses. Paul is saying that the righteousness which is the product of a man's own works is entirely human, whereas the righteousness which results from the faith inspired by God and mediated by the Spirit is alone acceptable to heaven.

> Paul proclaims, in words that to the Galatians must have rung out as a rallying-cry as they have done to succeeding generations, that when once a man is in Christ Jesus, his standing before God . . . is not affected one whit by the question whether he is circumcised or not . . . With the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, distinctions of this kind cease to carry any weight at all, and the only thing that avails for salvation is faith in Him--a faith which works through love, or, it may be, which is set in motion by love. [emphasis his][1]

The theme of the entire epistle has been summed up in these last two lines--"For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." The first four chapters have dealt with this proposition regarding circumcision (which stands for all the outward observances of Judaism), and the last section, chapters five and six, apply the second proposition, namely

---

[1]Duncan, pp. 156-157.

that true faith works through love. The first proposition is Paul's summary of the character of contemporary Judaism, while the second is his summary of the nature of Christianity. By the first he says--The essence of Judaism is that external works avail to make a man righteous. In contrast, the second statement asserts that the essence of Christianity consists of an attitude of the heart, and the true Christian is motivated, not by the legalistic outlook of the Jew, but by faith and love.

The argument in verse eleven was probably much easier for the local churches of the first century to understand than for readers of today. "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? than is the offence of the cross ceased." Probably what is meant is that there had been a time when Paul had permitted Jewish converts to continue the rite as regards their offspring, rather than give unnecessary offence to unbelieving Jews. Apparently some of his critics in Galatia had used this in support of the claim that Paul himself preached circumcision.

> Paul's point would seem to be that his opponents are not consistent in their attacks on him. 'They began by persecuting me for not demanding that Gentile converts should be circumcised. Now they insinuate that at heart I recognize the necessity of circumcision, and sometimes enforce it. They cannot have it both ways. If they themselves believe that I do preach circumcision, why do they go on persecuting me for not preaching it?'[1]

> Circumcision is taken as occupying, in the Judaising system, the same place that the cross of Christ occupied in that of St. Paul. The two things are alternatives. If one is taught there is no need for the other.[2]

Lest his emphasis on liberty should be misunderstood and interpreted as antinomianism or licentiousness, Paul guards his doctrine

---

[1]Duncan, p. 160.

[2]Sanday, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 457.

by adding: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." vs 13, 14

Highly significant is his use of the word "serve." Prior to this he has emphasized the bondage of Judaism as then practiced, and has warned against service to such. Now he declares that while the Christian is set at liberty from all the bondage of human requirements there is a true service required of the believer.

> . . . here Paul is dealing rather with the general principle that Christian freedom, so far from implying lack of restraint, is the acceptance of a new but glad and willing servitude, according to which, with love as a motive power in our hearts, we seek not to please ourselves but to serve one another. . . . the implication is that, free as we are, we are not our own masters; our life, like that of our Lord, must be a life spent in the service of our brethren; for if the binding force of law is no longer operative, there has entered into our lives the new constraining force of Christian love.[1]

This affirmation of Paul's is meant to protect him from misunderstanding. Having strenuously opposed one extreme of conduct, he wisely forewarns his listeners not to swing to the other extreme. Because they are free from the legal structure of the Jews with its multitudinous requirements, they are not to think that they can now give free rein to what Paul denominates "the flesh." While no speaker can safeguard himself from each and every misconstruction placed on his words, it is certainly the path of wisdom for him to buttress his main premises in such a way that only the weakminded or the malicious could misconstrue his basic positions.

The thought of true service to God and man is extended in the next verses.

---

[1]Duncan, pp. 163-164.

> . . . if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. vs 18-23

Paul here declares that the true Christian is led by the Holy Spirit. He is not "under law," that is, he is not motivated by a legalistic spirit. (It should be noted that in the original Greek there is no article before the word "law." To be "under law" in Paul's mind meant to be subject to the constraint of legalism.)

Duncan has paraphrased the words of Paul as follows.

> When you attain to a relation with God which is truly spiritual, you pass into a sphere in which legalism in any shape or form no longer holds sway. As has been argued in chaps. iii and iv., law is for servants; but if we know ourselves no longer servants, but free-born sons, our relationship must express itself not in legal obedience but in spiritual affinity.[1]

The list of the "works of the flesh" is given in order that the Galatians might make a test of their own experience and discover whether they are walking according "to the flesh" or "in the Spirit." Luther says: "And this doth Paul because there were many hypocrites amongst the Galatians (as there are also at this day among us).[2]

In contrast to the "works of the flesh," Paul catalogues "the fruit of the Spirit." This strengthens his contention regarding the true nature of the Christian life. The list here given constitutes good evidence of the quality of Paul's resources of Invention. The catalogue of

---

[1]Duncan, p. 169.

[2]Luther, Commentary on Galatians, p. 510.

Christian graces has nowhere its counterpart in all the realm of pagan literature. In this reference to "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" we have a compendium of major Pauline values. As will be pointed out in the conclusion, these values have done much towards shaping the ethics and institutions of the Western world.

The contrasting lists found in this setting have yet another significance. It is typical of Paul's overflowing and comprehensive thought that an expression be made to serve more than one purpose. In these verses he not only sharply distinguishes between the genuine worshipper and the hypocrite, but he infers that the religion of the Judaizing teachers might inculcate a formal ceremonial holiness bereft of the "fruit of the Spirit" and manifesting instead "the works of the flesh." It is as though he declared: "My dear Galatians, you may practice circumcision and a thousand other ceremonial observances, but if these serve only to excuse "the works of the flesh" in your lives, then your experience is a sham."

The warning against misunderstanding his emphasis on Christian freedom reaches its climax in the next chapter where the Apostle declares:

> Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due time we shall reap, if we faint not. As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith. 6:7-10

Had this passage occurred in the first chapter instead of the last, we would have felt that the Apostle was lacking in powers of logical arrangement. These verses place much emphasis upon "doing," while hitherto he has been warning the Galatains against believing that their

religious works can earn salvation. Only when perceived as an antidote to any perversion of his former emphasis, do these later statements seem appropriate.

We have traced the leading idea of the epistle--the Christian's freedom from the motives and requirements of contemporary Judaism.

There is a complementary theme running throughout the letter, and particularly dilated upon in the central chapters, which also should be considered. This complementary theme has reference to the purpose and place of the dispensation of the law which was ushered in at Sinai. The word "law" occurs over thirty times in this discourse, and more than half of these references are in the central two chapters. In the discussion of this theme we find exemplified Paul's use of logic. The only Pauline parallel to the concise, incisive argumentation of chapters three and four is to be found in the book of Romans, which seems to have been prepared almost as a lawyer's brief. The main paragraphs of Paul's with reference to this theme of the purpose of the law are here reproduced from Galatians.

> . . . The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand to Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all the nations be blessed." So then, those who are men of faith are blessed with Abraham who had faith.
>
> For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, "Cursed be every one who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law, and do them." Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the law; for "He who through faith is righteous shall live"; but the law does not rest on faith, for "He who does them shall live by them." Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us--for it is written, "Cursed be every one who hangs on a tree"--that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.
>
> To give a human example, brethren: no one annuls even a man's will, or adds to it, once it has been ratified. Now the promises were made to Abraham and to his offspring. It does not say, "And to offsprings," referring to many; but, referring to one,

"And to your offspring," which is Christ. This is what I mean: the law, which came four hundred and thirty years afterward, does not annul a covenant previously ratified by God, so as to make the promise void. For if the inheritance is by the law, it is no longer by promise; but God gave it to Abraham by a promise.

Why then the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the offspring should come to whom the promise had been made; and it was ordained by angels through an intermediary. Now an intermediary implies more than one; but God is one.

Is the law then against the promises of God? Certainly not, for if a law had been given which could make alive, then righteousness would indeed be by the law. But the scripture consigned all things to sin, that what was promised to faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe.

Now before faith came, we were confined under the law, kept under restraint until faith should be revealed. So that the law was our custodian until Christ came, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a custodian; for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise. Galatians 3:8-29. RSV

In this discussion of the law Paul apparently has in mind the many questions in the minds of the confused Galatians. It is as though he had heard them ask such questions as: "Why did God give the law if men cannot be justified by observance of it?" "What can be the relationship between Paul's emphasis on justification by faith, and the rules and regulations of the Old Testament Scriptures?" "Wherein do Paul and our new teachers differ as regards the significance of the covenant entered into by Israel at Mt. Sinai?"[1]

---

[1]Most orators have recognized the necessity for answering in their speeches the unvoiced objections of their hearers. One public speaker of recent times has expressed this in the following quotation. He is not referred to as one embodying the highest rhetorical ideals, but because of his insight in this particular matter.

"It was important to see clearly in advance of each single speech the probable contents and the form of the objections that might be

Paul's first point is that the gospel of faith preceded the giving of the law by several centuries. "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles 'by faith,' really proclaimed the Gospel centuries ago in the words, 'In three shall all nations be blessed.'" The Apostle is quoting from Gen 13:3 where is recorded the prediction that even the Gentiles were to share the blessings of Abraham. This event took place long years before the forming of the covenant between God and national Israel. Thus it is evident, suggests Paul, that to save the Gentiles through faith rather than through law must have been God's primary purpose. This argument is linked to the preceding reminder that Abraham himself had been accounted righteous as a result of his faith in God. "You can go right back to Abraham to see the principle of faith in God. He, we are told, "believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Can you not see, then, that all those who 'believe God' are the real sons of Abraham'?" 3:6, 7 Phillips. Thus the Apostle draws on references from the first book of the Old Testament Scriptures to prove his position that faith rather than law is primary to the gospel.

The next argument is that seeking salvation by the pathway of legalism leads to a curse rather than a blessing. "Everyone, however, who is involved in trying to keep the Law's demands falls under a curse, for it is written:

---

expected during the discussion and then completely to pick them to pieces in one's own speech. Thereby it was advisable to mention at once the possible objections and to prove their untenability; thus a listener who had come, although stuffed with the objections he had been taught, but otherwise with an honest heart, was won more easily by the refutation of the doubts that had been impressed into his memory. The material he had been taught was automatically refuted and his attention was attracted more and more by the speech. Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939), p. 701.

> Cursed in everyone which continueth not
> In all things which are written in the book of the Law,
> To do them. 3:10 Phillips

Because no human being can perfectly observe with heart, mind, and body every requirement of God, whoever truststo his works to save him will thereby earn only a curse. The best of men fall short by sins of omission as well as sins of commission, and therefore the Galatians are forgetting first principles, and heading for failure if they strive to earn God's favour by their own works of self-righteousness. Such is Paul's argument. It is clearly set forth in another letter that he wrote about this time, and which will be quoted here as summarising in content what was probably the substance of the first preaching of the Apostle's in Galatia.

> Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Rom 3:19-27

Thus far Paul has argued (1) that ages before the covenant made with Israel on Sinai, God had promised righteousness to all who depended upon Christ rather than upon their own works, and (2) because it is impossible perfectly to observe the comprehensive requirements of the Law, whoever seeks righteousness through the Torah will instead earn only the curse pronounced upon disobedience.

The next argument is that the Old Testament distinctly claims that the motivating principles of action in the life of the righteous will be faith, not legalism. "It is made still plainer that no one is justified in God's sight by obeying the Law, for:

The righteous shall live by faith." Gal 3:11 Phillips

This time the quotation used by the Apostle comes from Habakkuk 2:4. Paul defends himself constantly from the charge of innovation by pointing out that the principles he has taught are clearly expressed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament an authority accepted by his hearers.[1] As he proceeds to show that the ruling principle of the Law is works and not faith, again he refers to a passage from the Pentateuch to support his point. "And the Law is not a matter of faith at all but of doing, as, for example, in the Scripture: He that doeth them shall live in them." Gal 3:12 Phillips.

> If man could yield perfect obedience to the Law, then he would be just and could live by the Law, instead of by faith. But can he yield such an obedience? No. . . . And so man remains under the curse of the Law, until saved by faith.[2]

Paul's next statement purposely lacks any connecting particle in the original Greek. This seems to be done in order to emphasize the

---

[1]The wish of the Galatians to comply even with the ritual laws of the Old Testament indicates the reverence they held for these writings. Paul's arguments from the Scriptures indicates the same situation.

It should be kept in mind that the record of Acts shows that Paul's method of evangelising the heathen was to effect a transition in belief from the God of Nature to the God of Revelation. Paul usually began his preaching by pointing to the evidence in the natural world for the existence of a Supreme Being. Next he showed that this Divine Being had revealed Himself to human beings through the inspired oracles entrusted to the Jews. The third step was to point out that these Old Testament writings foretold the coming of a Redeemer. Lastly, Paul declared that the life of Jesus had fulfilled these Old Testament predictions. Thus wherever a Gentile church was established by Paul, its members had implicit confidence in the Old Testament Scriptures.

[2]Carl Aaron Swensson, "Annotations on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians," The Lutheran Commentary, ed. Henry Eyster Jacobs, 12 vols. (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1895-1898), Vol. 8, p. 374.

greatness of the glad contrast announced.

> Now Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the Law's condemnation, by Himself becoming a curse for us when He was crucified. For the Scripture is plain: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. Gal 3:13 Phillips

Having established to his own mind at least that the Sacred Scriptures were clear regarding man's hoplessness without Christ, Paul climaxes with his presentation of Christ as the only answer to man's dilemma. It is highly probable that his arguments would prove acceptable to most of the Galatians for they were based upon the Old Testament revelation which they already endorsed.[1] The culminating presentation of Christ as the solution to man's problem regarding righteousness would probably also be acceptable to the Galatians both on the basis of the preceding arguments, and also because of their original experience with the gospel of Christ.

The substance of the enthymemes of Paul can be abridged as follows to summarise the arguments of the preceding verses.

1. Faith is God's primary instrument of righteousness rather than law, because ages before Sinai the Lord announced that Gentiles would be saved through trust in Him.
2. If Abraham "the father of the faithful" was justified by faith, then the true descendents of Abraham will be justified in the same way.
3. Because the Old Testament pronounces a curse upon those who fail to conform in entirety to the Law, it is evident that those who seek justification via that path will only merit a curse, inasmuch as it is impossible for an imperfect human being to keep perfect law.
4. The Old Testament clearly asserts that the guiding principle

---

[1]See footnote page 288.

in the life of the justified is the principle of faith. Therefore the purpose of the Law cannot be that of justification.

5. The Old Testament also teaches that the basic principle underlying the Law is quite different to the principle of faith. The former principle is related to doing but the latter to believing. Because these are not identical it is obvious that the purpose of the Law should never be equated with the purpose of faith.
6. While we by nature are under the curse or condemnation of the law, through God's grace manifested in Christ, we may receive forgiveness and righteousness.

Having set forth these enthymemes, Paul concludes with:

> God's purpose is therefore plain: that the blessing promised to Abraham might reach the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, and the Spirit might become available to us all by faith.
>
> Gal 3:14 Phillips.

It is noteworthy that the Apostle admirably sums up in this sentence the essence of each of his preceding arguments. By the reference to "God's purpose" he infers what he had stated in verse eight of this chapter: "And the scripture, forseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." The implication of the first two words of Paul's conclusion in verse fourteen is that the gospel of faith which he, Paul, is proclaiming is no new thing. It has been part of God's purpose for long ages, as evidenced by the Scriptural account of the promise to Abraham regarding the blessing of the Gentiles. The reference to Abraham in this verse of summary refers back to the argument that Abraham was justified by his faith in God, and that therefore his true descendents will be justified according to the same manner. When Paul says in this same verse "through Jesus Christ," he is affirming the substance of his final argument before this conclusion and expressed in verse thirteen:

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us . . ." The implication would be also that there was no other way of receiving the blessing, despite the teachings of the Judaizers. This he had stressed by his prior deductions from the authoritative writings of the Old Testament. When we reach the words "by faith" at the end of the summary it is not difficult to recognize these words as the underlying maxim of the entire discussion. We would venture to affirm that comparatively few speakers have had such skill at synthesising and summarising as this Christian orator.

Recognizing that abstract argument alone would probably not be sufficient to make his point of view evident to the Galatians, the Apostle proceeds to illustrate.

> Let me give you an everyday illustration, my brother. Once a contract has been properly drawn up and signed, it is honoured by both parties, and can neither be disregarded nor modified by a third party.
>
> Now a Promise was made to Abraham and his seed. (Note in passing that the Scripture says not "seeds" but uses the singular "seed," meaning Christ.) I say then that the Law, which came into existence four hundred and thirty years later, cannot render null and void the original "contract" which God had made, and thus rob the Promise of its value. For if the receiving of the promised blessing were now made to depend on the Law, that would amount to a cancellation of the original "contract" which God made with Abraham as a Promise. Gal 3:15-18 Phillips

In this argument based on analogy Paul declares that after any human contract has been signed it is thereupon binding and beyond legal change. Similarly God's agreement with Abraham was valid from its ratification at that time, and could not be altered by subsequent events at Sinai. New terms, Paul is saying, would require a new contract altogether, and therefore it cannot be believed that the giving of the Mosaic law changed the earlier agreement made with Abraham.

> The reason why the Apostle introduces this point is that the Law might be supposed to restrict the bearings of the promise. It might be thought to add certain new and limiting conditions, without compliance with which the blessings of the promise could not be obtained. This was the position of the Judaising party, against which St. Paul was arguing.[1]

While the cogency of Paul's analogy seems apparent there also seems to be a danger in the direction of the Apostle's argument. Some of the Galatians might say at this juncture: "Well, if Paul is speaking what is right on this matter, what was the purpose of the Law? Why did God give to Israel her special code if its requirements have nothing to do with our obtaining salvation?" As with many other capable speakers Paul decided to answer these queries before they were voiced.

> Where then lies the point of the Law? It was an addition made to underline the existence and extent of sin until the arrival of the "Seed" to Whom the Promise referred. Gal 3:19 Phillips.

In his illustration of the human contract, Paul, in what seems typical rabbinical fashion, had parenthetically supported his case by the Old Testament's use of the singular noun "seed" rather than the plural. This "seed" has particular reference to Christ, according to Paul.[2] The Messiah is the true "seed" of the Father of the Faithful, and therefore God's promise finds its special application in the Person of Christ. Thus in the verse just quoted it is suggested that the purpose of the Jewish law was to make evident the need of a Redeemer. By its clear delineation of sin, by its stress on the ceremonial washings etc. that implied contamination with evil, the law would emphasize humanity's plight, and thus underline the necessity of a Saviour. Paul's main point here would appear cogent to many modern minds, but his play upon the use of the singular noun rather than the plural is not as congenial to contemporary

---

[1]Sanday, Ellicott, p. 445.

[2]See Gal 3:15-18.

thinkers. It smacks of the cabbalistic interpretations of mystics. How shall we judge this parenthetic argument based on the use of "seed" instead of "seeds"? Certainly no worthy speech critic would wish to see this device aligned against present practice, inasmuch as "time and place factors" admittedly influence methods of persuasion. The following quotation places this reference in its true framework of Christian thought in the first century.

> The argument of the Apostle turns upon the use, both in the Hebrew and in the LXX., of a singular instead of a plural noun. Both in the Hebrew and in the LXX., however, the noun, though singular, is collective. It meant, in the first instance at least, not any one individual, but the posterity of Abraham as a whole. The Apostle refers it to Christ and the "spiritual Israel" (i.e., the Church, of which He is the Head), on the same principle on which, throughout the New Testament, the history of the chosen people under the old covenant is taken as a type of the Christian dispensation. We may compare Matt. ii. 15, where an allusion to the exodus of Israel from Egypt is treated as a type of the return of the Holy Family from their flight into Egypt. Such passages are not to be regarded as arguments possessing a permanent logical validity (which would be to apply the rigid canons of Western logic to a case for which they are unsuitable), but rather as marked illustrations of the organic unity which the apostolic writers recognised in the pre-Christian and Christian dispensations. Not only had both the same Author, and formed part of the same scheme, but they were actually the counterparts one of the other. The events which characterised the earlier dispensation had their analogies--sometimes spiritual, sometimes literal--in the later.[1]

Paul proceeds to contrast the proclamation of the Law on Sinai with the giving of the promise to Abraham.

> The Law was inaugurated in the presence of angels and by the hand of a human intermediary. The very fact that there was an intermediary is enough to show that this was not the fulfilling of the Promise. For the Promise of God needs neither angelic witness nor human intermediary but depends on Him alone.
>
> Gal 3:19-20 Phillips.

---

[1]Sanday, Ellicott, pp. 445-446.

It is alluded to here that Israel received the Law through the ministration of Moses, whom God chose as a mediator. The necessity for an intermediary implies the existence of two parties to a contract. The Law, says Paul, was such a contract with conditions attached. But the Promise required no intermediary, and its fulfillment does not depend upon human prowess but upon the ability and grace of God. Therefore the Promise stands superior to the Law.

The Apostle is not content to leave the matter there. It is too vital to the whole Galatian controversy to be dismissed without full consideration. He decides to underline what he had stated in the first half of verse nineteen, regarding the purpose of the Mosaic code.

> Is the Law then to be looked upon as a contradiction of the Promise? Certainly not, for if there could have been a law which gave men spiritual life then that law would have produced righteousness (which would have been, of course, in full harmony with the purpose of the Promise). But, as things are, the Scripture has all men "imprisoned," because they are found guilty by the Law, that to men in such condition the Promise might come to release all who believe in Jesus Christ.
>
> Gal 3:21, 22 Phillips.

Thus it is stated that the objective of the Law is to lead men to desire the fulfillment of the Promise. The Law, because of man's moral weakness, can never justify. It is powerless to give spiritual life. On the other hand, Paul contends that the Law "imprisons" men, condemns them as transgressors with the result that they are led to find deliverance in Christ through simple faith. A parallel passage to the above is found in a contemporary epistle probably written by Paul from the same city the same year. This passage clarifies his argument still further.

> No condemnation now hangs over the head of those who are "in" Jesus Christ. For the new spiritual principle of life "in" Christ lifts me out of the old vicious circle of sin and death.
>
> The Law never succeeded in producing righteousness--the failure was always the weakness of human nature. But God has

> met this by sending His own Son Jesus Christ to live in that human nature which causes the trouble. And, while Christ was actually taking upon Himself the sins of men, God condemned that sinful nature. So that we are able to meet the Law's requirements, so long as we are living no longer by the dictates of our sinful nature, but in obedience to the promptings of the Spirit. Rom 8:1-4 Phillips. (emphasis his)

There can be no reasonable doubt that Paul had explained these teachings to the Galatians when he first presented the gospel to them. His statements in this letter do not fall upon their ears as something new. Rather, they are reaffirmations. It is even possible that this covering of the same ground would have the effect of arousing in the Galatian converts happy memories of the occasions when they had first heard the gospel of grace from Paul. Perhaps the Apostle's recognition of this possibility may have led him to link his argument on the Law with the present standing and privileges of these believers. It is at this juncture that the thought of freedom is re-introduced, and this key-note recurs constantly in the next two chapters as the Apostle reaches the climax of his appeal.

> . . . the Law was like a strict governess in charge of us until we went to the school of Christ and learned to be justified by faith in Him. Once we had that faith we were completely free from the governess's authority. . . . Gone is the distinction between Jew and Greek, slave and free man, male and female--you are all one in Christ Jesus. Gal 3:24-28 Phillips

> You, my brother, are not a servant any longer; you are a son. And, if you are a son, then you are certainly an heir of God through Christ. 4:7 Phillips.

Thus does the logic of this discourse merge into pathos. That the conviction resulting from argument should be intensified by the emotions coincident with newly found freedom would seem to have been Paul's conscious or unconscious intention in this new emphasis. Reference will be made again to this transition in the section on Pathos.

The third major theme in the epistle to the Galatians is that of Paul's Apostolic authority.[1] This had been challenged by the Judaizers, and it is significant that Paul defends himself on this score before he proceeds to enunciate his main themes regarding law, and liberty. He is well aware that men do not give ready ear to the counsel of one who has been discredited. Certainly, the Judaizers could not have succeeded in their endeavors to oust the missionary to the Gentiles from the affections of his converts. He could not have addressed them as he does in this letter had such been the case. As a spiritual father he addresses the "sons" who have been tempted to deny his authority. The first section of the discourse, the opening two chapters, constitute the Apostle's attempt at self-vindication. It follows:

> I, Paul, who am appointed and commissioned as Special Messenger not by man but by Jesus Christ and God the Father (Who raised Him from the dead), I and all the brothers with me send the churches in Galatia greeting. Grace and peace to you from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ, Who according to the Father's Plan gave Himself for our sins and thereby rescued us from the present evil world-order. To Him be glory for ever and ever!
>
> I am amazed that you have so quickly transferred your allegiance from Him Who called you in the grace of Christ to another "gospel"! Not, of course, that it is or ever could be another gospel, but there are obviously men who are upsetting your faith with a travesty of the Gospel of Christ. Yet I say that if I, or an angel from heaven, were to preach to you any other gospel than the one you have heard, may he be damned! You have heard me say it before and now I put it down in black and white--may anybody who preaches any other gospel than the one you have already heard be a damned soul! (Does that make you think now that I am serving man's interests or God's? If I were trying to win human approval I should never be Christ's servant.)
>
> The Gospel I preach to you is no human invention. No man gave it to me, no man taught it to me; it came to me as a direct revelation from Jesus Christ.

---

[1]It is recognized that this theme has direct bearing on ethos, and it is therefore also discussed under that heading.

For you have heard of my past career in the Jewish religion, how I persecuted the Church of God with fanatical zeal and, in fact, did my best to destroy it. I was ahead of most of my contemporaries in the Jewish religion, and had a greater enthusiasm for the old traditions. But when the time came for God (Who was responsible both for my physical birth and for my being called by His grace), to reveal His Son within me so that I might proclaim Him to the non-Jewish world, I did not, as might have been expected, talk over the matter with any human being. I did not even go to Jerusalem to meet those who were Special Messengers before me--no, I went away to Arabia and later came back to Damascus. It was not until three years later that I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I only stayed with him just over a fortnight. I did not meet any of the other Special Messengers, except James, the Lord's brother.

All this that I am telling you is, I assure you before God, the plain truth. Later, I visited districts in Syria and Cilicia, but I was still personally unknown to the churches of Judaea. All they knew of me, in fact, was the saying: "The man who used to persecute us is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy." And they thanked God for what had happened to me.

Fourteen years later, I went up to Jerusalem again, this time with Barnabas, and we took Titus with us. My visit on this occasion was by divine command, and I gave a full exposition of the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles. I did this first in private conference with the Church leaders, to make sure that what I had done and proposed doing was acceptable to them. Not one of them intimated that Titus, because he was a Greek, ought to be circumcised. In fact, the suggestion would never have risen but for the presence of some pseudo-Christians, who wormed their way into our meeting to spy on the liberty we enjoy in Jesus Christ, and then attempted to tie us up with rules and regulations. We did not give those men an inch, for the truth of the Gospel for you and all Gentiles was at stake. And as far as the leaders of the conference were concerned (I neither know nor care what their exact position was: God is not impressed with a man's office), they had nothing to add to my gospel. In fact they recognised that the gospel for the uncircumcised was as much my commission as that the gospel for the circumcised was Peter's. For the God who had done such great work in Peter's ministry for the Jews was plainly doing the same in my ministry for the Gentiles. When, therefore, James, Cephas and John (who were the recognised "pillars" of

> the Church there) saw how God had given me His grace, they held out to Barnabas and me the right hand of fellowship, in full agreement that our mission was to the Gentiles and theirs to the Jews. The only suggestion they made was that we should not forget the poor--and with this I was, of course, only too ready to agree.
>
> Later, however, when Peter came to Antioch I had to oppose him publicly, for he was then plainly in the wrong. It happened like this. Until the arrival of some of James's companions, he, Peter was in the habit of eating his meals with the Gentiles. After they came, however, he withdrew and ate separately from the Gentiles--out of sheer fear of what the Jews might think. The other Jewish Christians carried out a similar piece of deception, and the force of their bad example was so great that even Barnabas was affected by it. But when I saw that this behaviour was a contradiction of the truth of the Gospel, I said to Peter so that everyone could hear, "If you, who are a Jew, do not live like a Jew but like a Gentile, why on earth do you try to make Gentiles live like Jews?" And then I went on to explain that we, who are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners, know that a man is justified not by performing what the Law commands but by faith in Jesus Christ. Gal 1-2:16 Phillips

In the first breath of his message Paul asserts that he is a divinely chosen Apostle. "Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead; . . ." This is followed by reference to the other problem agitating the minds of the Galatians, namely whether the "new" gospel from the Judaizers is to be accepted, verses six to ten. Then the claim of the opening sentence is reinforced.

> But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.
> vs 11, 12

Thus Paul at the introduction of his discourse ties together the two issues regarding his authority and his gospel. The reference in between to the teachings of his opponents indicates that these are to be judged according to the truth or falsity of Paul's own claims which precede and follow.

Thus the theme of the first two chapters has been announced by the missionary to the Gentiles. He has submitted the proposition that his authority and his message are God-given. In the remainder of these introductory chapters evidence is drawn from six periods of his life to prove the proposition he has offered.

a. Evidence drawn from his life before his conversion 1:13, 14.
b. Evidence drawn from the circumstances of his conversion and his conduct immediately thereafter 1:15-17.
c. Evidence drawn from a visit to Jerusalem three years after his conversion 1:18-20.
d. Evidence drawn from the period of his stay in Syria and Cilicia 1:21-24.
e. Evidence drawn from his conduct on a visit to Jerusalem fourteen years after the preceding one 2:1-10.
f. Evidence drawn from his conduct in resisting Peter at Antioch 2:11-14.[1]

a. Evidence drawn from his life before his conversion 1:13, 14.

> For you have heard of my past career in the Jewish religion, how I persecuted the Church of God with fanatical zeal and, in fact, did my best to destroy it. I was ahead of most of my contemporaries in the Jewish religion, and had a greater enthusiasm for the old traditions. Phillips.

The argument is that anybody with the education and antecedents that Paul had had would be the most unlikely person to become a Christian. It is inferred that only Divine intervention could accomplish a miracle of this kind. That there is some weight in this argument is indicated not only by the stress that Christian apologists have made of it but also by the fact that some famous sceptics such as Lord Lyttelton have changed their attitude to Christianity after studying this famous volte face.

b. Evidence drawn from the circumstances of his conversion and his conduct immediately thereafter 1:15-17.

> But when the time came for God (Who was responsible for my physical birth and for my being called by His grace), to reveal His Son within me so that I might proclaim Him to the non-Jewish world, I did not, as might have been expected, talk over the

---

[1]Burton, p. lxxii.

> matter with any human being. I did not even go to Jerusalem to meet those who were Special Messengers before me--no, I went away to Arabia and later came back to Damascus.
>
> Phillips.

By these words Paul is asserting that his conversion and mission had been decreed by God long before his birth. It had been "predestinated." This being the case, divine interposition had accomplished his submission to the teaching he had formerly considered as heresy.

> . . . the apostle denies not only that he sought instruction from the Twelve in particular, but that he put himself in communication with men at all, excluding not only the receiving of instruction, but the imparting of it. The only natural, almost the only possible, implication is that he sought communion with God, a thought sufficiently indicated on the one side by the antithesis of "flesh and blood" and on the other by the mention of the relatively desert land to which he went.[1]

c. Evidence drawn from a visit to Jerusalem three years after his conversion 1:18-20.

> It was not until three years later that I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I only stayed with him just over a fortnight. I did not meet any of the other Special Messengers, except James, the Lord's brother.
>
> All this that I am telling you is, I assure you before God, the plain truth. Phillips.

This is another argument for Paul's independent apostleship. When ultimately he had visited Jerusalem, the headquarters of the infant church, he had not even then consulted the elder Apostles. True, he admits seeing Peter and James, but it was for so short a period during this time of preaching that he could hardly have received from them an outline of Christian theology.

d. Evidence drawn from the period of his stay in Syria and Cilicia. 1:21-24.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 55.

> Later, I visited districts in Syria and Cilicia, but I was still personally unknown to the churches of Judaea. All they knew of me, in fact, was the saying: "The man who used to persecute us is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy." And they thanked God for what had happened to me. Phillips.

In other words, the preaching tour described was in regions outside the area dominated by the elder Apostles. This is evidence that he was not under the direction of the Twelve, but rather he was engaged in independent work. Paul had not preached in the churches of Judaea. Furthermore this historical record indicates that the Christian communities which existed amidst the sacred scenes of the Lord' life had shown great joy at the reports of his ministry. It was apparent that those in the best position to judge concerning the reality of his profession had manifested no opposition. So Paul argues.

e. Evidence drawn from his conduct on a visit to Jerusalem fourteen years after the preceding one 2:1-10.

> Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus along with me. I went up by revelation; and I laid before them (but privately before those who were of repute) the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, lest somehow I should be running or had run in vain. But even Titus, who was with me, was not compelled to be circumcised, though he was a Greek. But because of false brethren secretly brought in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage--to them we did not yield submission even for a moment, that the truth of the gospel might be preserved for you. And from those who were reputed to be something (what they were makes no difference to me; God shows no partiality)--those, I say, who were of repute added nothing to me; but on the contrary, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been entrusted with the gospel to the circumcised (for he who worked through Peter for the mission to the circumcised worked through me also for the Gentiles), and when they perceived the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised; only they would have us remember the poor, which very thing I was eager to do. RSV

Thus Paul describes the second occasion on which he was able to make contact with the leaders of the Church. He declares that on this occasion he mixed freely with the believers in corporate groups, and with the leaders in private conference. Despite this, there had been no resultant opposition from church leaders to his teachings or his practice. Indeed, Paul reminiscences, some Judaizers endeavored to influence the Twelve to order the circumcision of his Gentile associate Titus, but this endeavour was significantly unsuccessful, indicating that the Twelve fully countenanced Paul's manner of working, and recognized in him an instrument of God. Furthermore the Church leaders had acknowledged that Paul's ministry was to be among the non-Jewish peoples, and the only suggestion they had offered was that he should remember the needs of the poverty-stricken Jewish Christians.

> Thoughts and arguments crowd in upon the Apostle with great vehemence. His amanuensis cannot take them down fast enough. Sentences are begun and not rightly ended, and much of the sense is left to be supplied by conjecture. The general drift of the passage is sufficiently plain, but there is much uncertainty about the details.[1]

The original Greek of this passage indicates that Paul's thoughts at this juncture had come tumultuously upon him. The style evidences sincerity and negates duplicity, strengthening by ethical considerations the logical positions set forth. Those who plan to deceive are far more careful in expression than is the case with Paul when he is vehement.

f. Evidence drawn from his conduct in resisting Peter at Antioch 2:11-14.

> Later, however, when Peter came to Antioch I had to oppose him publicly, for he was then plainly in the wrong. It happened like this. Until the arrival of some of James's companions, he, Peter, was in the habit of eating his meals with the Gentiles. After they came, however, he withdrew and ate separately from the Gentiles--out of sheer fear of what the Jews might think. The other Jewish Christians carried out a similar piece of

---

[1]Sanday, p. 433.

> deception, and the force of their bad example was so great that even Barnabas was affected by it. But when I saw that this behaviour was a contradiction of the truth of the Gospel, I said to Peter so that everyone could hear, "If you, who are a Jew, do not live like a Jew but like a Gentile, why on earth do you try to make Gentiles live like Jews?" Phillips

Apparently Peter had visited Antioch and at first mixed freely with the Gentile believers. Upon the arrival of some representatives from Jerusalem who though Christian were still nationally minded, Peter proved guilty of inconsistency. Through fear of criticism from his stricter brethren he had gradually withdrawn himself from the company of the Gentile believers, and simultaneously influenced others such as Barnabas to follow his example. At such a time Paul had not hesitated to openly rebuke the vacillating Apostle. This recital by Paul is a fitting climax to his evidences of independent apostleship, for it reveals him as one who is not subject to any human authority as regards creed. From here, the argument imperceptibly almost in transition, merges into a discussion of the significance of the Jewish Law concerning which he had disputed with Peter.

Thus we conclude the review of Paul's primary ideas and arguments as found in the epistle to the Galatians. While bathed in emotion, logical considerations are made foremost throughout. This is the most polemical of all recorded addresses of the Apostle. In this instance there seems abundant evidence that the criteria for measuring logical capacity find adequate conformity in the reasoning processes outlined. The Apostle very clearly discerned "the problem disturbing the status quo" and he thoroughly analysed "the nature and bearing of the problem upon the social setting." Furthermore he revealed impressive "fertility of mind in suggesting ideas relevant to the solution of difficulty" as well as "acuteness in examining, through reasoning, the implications of his suggestions."[1] Paul had readily

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 336.

perceived that his own authority and the truthfulness of his teaching were under suspicion at Galatia, and that confirmation of these must be brought about by a review of the implications of his career, and by a closely reasoned explanation of the relationship between the Jewish law and the Christian gospel.

One criticism that could be offered concerning the logical content of this discourse is that for a speech some would view as ephemeral in nature it contained too many ideas. It is doubtful whether the average audience could grasp and retain the whole gamut of Paul's argument. The succession of enthymemes concerning the law in the heart of the letter requires some thinking through to perceive their full import, and it is questionable whether the average listener today would be capable of doing this. In answer to such a criticism, however, it should be pointed out that the Galatians were much more familiar with the theological implications of the situation than any modern audience would be. Secondly, while this epistle was to be read aloud to the Church in harmony with early church procedure, it was not then to be destroyed. On the contrary, it was to be cherished and read and re-read, as well as circulated among other groups. Thus we could expect a greater amount of argumentation than would be found in a speech that would have but one presentation.

Concerning the reasoning employed to support the proposition of Paul's independent apostleship, it is evident that this is argument by signs; and as with all such arguments, it is not conclusive. Inasmuch however, as the very nature of rhetoric is related to probability and not demonstration, such arguments can not be considered as inapt. The reasoning employed concerning the Law is more formal in nature, and based as it is upon an authority accepted by the Galatians, namely the Old Testament, it could hardly be excelled in this situation.

The themes at the beginning and close of the letter, namely Paul's personal authority, and the new freedom of the Galatians, have emotional and ethical overtones which probably did much to reinforce the logical impact of the whole.

Analysis of Pathos

As has already been stated, the first and third sections of this discourse carry strong emotional overtones and motivating power. In the first section, Paul by defending his authority had occasion to review some of the outstanding incidents of his life, and thereby he probably aroused in his hearers the sentiments of respect, admiration, and gratitude. In the last two chapters there is special emphasis upon the liberty which was now the privilege of the Galatians through the gospel. A strong appeal is made to self-preservation that this liberty might not be lost by giving heed to the Judaizers.

But most of all, Paul's appeal is made to what he believed was the basic desire of the human heart--the desire to have peace with God, and consequent calm of conscience. The overall objective of all his arguments is to reveal the way of justification, the way whereby a guilty soul might find acceptance with his Creator. Through the ages, men have made as great efforts or greater to achieve this result as they have to fulfill any material ambition. The following verses indicate Paul's appeal to the desire of the Galatians for justification, for harmony with God.

> Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father. . . .
> 1:3, 4 RSV

This opening blessing abounds with words of emotional and motivational significance. "Grace," "peace," "the Father," were

among the sweetest words in the vocabulary of the early church, and their use probably had an effect similar to that of great music which both calms and elevates. The clause "who gave himself for our sins" was probably calculated to arouse love and gratitude for Christ. "To deliver us from the present evil age" plucks at the motive of self-preservation. The overall implication is that this gospel preached by Paul is able to deliver the Galatians from bondage and fear, and reconcile them to God.

> I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ and turning to a different gospel--not that there is another gospel, but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel of heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, If any one is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be accursed. 1:6-9 RSV

Warning rolls of thunder seem to reverberate through this passage. By declaring that the gospel which some of the Galatians were on the verge of accepting was a false gospel, and that its teachers were accursed, Paul suggests that the converts are in danger of stepping into a great abyss. He hoped to arouse in them what he would have termed "godly fear," and what moderns would name as the motive of self-preservation.

The very essence of Paul's appeal to the desire for justification is found in the arguments of the following passage.

> . . . a man is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, in order to be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of the law, because by works of the law shall no one be justified. . . . For I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. I do not nullify the grace of God; for if justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose. 2:16-21 RSV

The Apostle warns his hearers that the very object they sought would be lost if they succumbed to the methods suggested by the Judaizers. Salvation, he asserts, is not to be gained by mere formal external observances. Justification is the fruit of union with Christ, of participation by faith in His crucifixion. Acceptance with God results when the sinner perceives the personal love of Christ for him, and in gratitude and love takes hold of the proffered grace of God. Such is Paul's argument which is so worded as not only to inform but to endeavor to inspire. The allusion to his own personal experience as one who has been crucified with Christ is an appeal to emulation. The warmth of this appeal overflows in his following rebuke.

> O foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified? Let me ask you only this: Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law, or by hearing with faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun with the Spirit, are you now ending with the flesh? Did you experience so many things in vain?--if it really is in vain. Does he who supplies the Spirit to you do so by works of the law, or by hearing with faith? 3:1-5 RSV

The first sentence contains a double allusion. The word translated "bewitched" properly refers to one who is supposed to be entranced by the influence of what the ancients called an "evil eye," particularly of envy and jealousy. In order to safeguard themselves from such an influence, the heathen often attached amulets to their persons, consisting sometimes of a portion of a writing esteemed as sacred. The word translated "publicly portrayed" <u>proegraphē</u> signifies "openly written as by large letters." Possibly this has reference to the Jewish practice of using phylacteries--tiny parchment scrolls of Scripture bound between the eyes. See Matthew 23:5. Thus the expanded meaning of Paul's words would be somewhat as the following:

> O foolish Galatians, --foolish as <u>children,</u> --who was it that <u>bewitched you</u> with his evil eye of jealousy? who envied you the liberty of Christ, and desired to spoil you of it? who beguiled

> you, my little children (Ga 4:19), whom I was rearing up as a father, into men in Christ? who beguiled you back into Judaism, with its rites and ceremonies and external observances? Your false teachers who so deal with you, would have written and bound before your eyes the scrolls of the Law; they would have laid upon you its outward fringes and phylacteries, and thus would have entangled you in bondage. Who envied you the liberty of the Gospel, which I, your Apostle, preached to you? who bewitched you, before whose eyes was written and bound by me, as your true spiritual scroll, your frontlet of Faith, your Spiritual Phylactery, CHRIST CRUCIFIED; and whom I had thus guarded, as I thought, against all the envious fascination of your spiritual enemies? (emphasis his)[1]

The ideas are so expressed as to endeavor to arouse in the Galatians feelings of shame concerning their own conduct, and indignation as regards their false teachers. The series of questions "are like so many aculei, darted rapidly forth in a volley from the heart of the Apostle, in the vehement emotion of his indignation and love."[2] Their memory of their initial reception of the Gospel is aroused, and this would necessarily be accompanied by some similar rush of feeling as was theirs on that momentous occasion.

After a parenthesis of doctrinal argument, Paul proceeds by referring again to the original pagan state of the Galatians and the joy wherewith they accepted deliverance from the bondage of heathenism as effected through the message of the Apostle. With Paul logical argument is rarely made the terminus, and conclusions are usually made to serve as transitions or introductions to passages with emotional emphasis.

> Formerly, when you did not know God, you were in bondage to beings that by nature are no gods; but now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits, whose slaves you want to be once more? You observe days, and months, and seasons, and years! I am afraid I have labored over you in vain.

---

[1]Wordsworth, Vol. 2, p. 56.

[2]Ibid., p. 57.

> Brethren, I beseech you, become as I am, for I also have become as you are. You did me no wrong; you know it was because of a bodily ailment that I preached the gospel to you at first; and though my condition was a trial to you, you did not scorn or despise me, but received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus. What has become of the satisfaction you felt? For I bear you witness that, if possible, you would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me. Have I then become your enemy by telling you the truth? They make much of you, but for no good purpose; they want to shut you out, that you may make much of them. For a good purpose it is always good to be made much of, and not only when I am present with you. My little children, with whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you! 4:8-19 RSV

A whole gamut of emotions and motives is encompassed in this passage. Gratitude was aimed at by the reference to their deliverance from bondage, and by the reminiscences concerning their former associations with their benefactor. The Apostle's expressed fear that he might have wasted his labour, and his metaphor concerning his "travail" because of them, was calculated to awaken shame and reproach. The reference to the previous love of the believers with the inferred contrast to the existing situation has the same objective, while the allusion to his infirmity would probably arouse pity. It is intimated that the objectives of the new teachers are selfish, and for those among the Galatians who were willing to consider this warning, the motive of self-preservation would be awakened.

Some explanation is required of the words: "I beseech you, become as I am, for I also have become as you are." v 12 Probably the meaning is that the Apostle is suggesting that his converts should become like him, free from the ceremonial observances of Judaism. Some commentators suggest that the meaning is: "Follow my example for I forsook my legal ground of righteousness and became as a Gentile like yourselves."

> The latter sense . . . is also more in character with the intense personal feeling which pervades the passage. 'I gave up all those time-honored customs, all those dear associations of race, to become like you. I have lived as a Gentile that I might preach to you Gentiles. Will you then abandon me, when I have abandoned all for you?'[1]

Martin Luther wrote on this verse:

> That he gives the Galatians so good words, is as much as to mix and temper the bitter wormwood drink so with honey and sugar that it may become sweet and pleasant. Even so do parents, when they have well flogged their children, give them good words, give them gingerbread, apples, pears, nuts and the like, that the children may take note and understand that their parents have at heart their good.[2]

The expression "my little children" should also be noted, as this is not found elsewhere in the addresses of Paul. The term suggests both the tenderness of the Apostle and the weakness of his converts. Thus it contains both affection and rebuke.

In the following chapter Paul climaxes his appeal to the desire of the Galatians for acceptance with God. He stresses that to follow the Judaizers is to place themselves outside the pale, and back within the bondage of heathenism.

> For freedom Christ has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery. Now I, Paul, say to you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you. I testify again to every man who receives circumcision that he is bound to keep the whole law. You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace. For through the Spirit, by faith, we wait for the hope of righteousness. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail, but faith working through love. You were running well; who hindered you from obeying the truth? This persuasion is not from him who called you. 5:1-8 RSV

---

[1]Schmoller, Lange's Commentary, Vol. 22, p. 106.

[2]Cited by Schmoller in Lange's Commentary, Vol. 22, p. 110.

The words "if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you," are climactic. Hitherto Paul has made no affirmation as strong regarding the results of conforming to the requirements of the Judaizing teachers. Now however, with his arguments presented, he does not hesitate to draw conclusions, and such conclusions as will be most likely to influence the Galatians. The same thought is repeated in several different ways, thus intensifying the emotional impact. "Christ will be of no advantage to you," "You are severed from Christ," "You have fallen away from grace."

The sentiments and tastes are appealed to in the contrasting pictures of the false and true worshippers.

> Now the works of the flesh are plain: immorality, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, anger, selfishness, dissension, party spirit, envy, drunkenness, carousing, and the like. . . . But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control. . . . And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires.
> 5:19-24 RSV

This appeal is continued by the Apostle's call to the spirit of forgiveness and humility.

> Brethren, if a man isovertaken in any trespass, you who are spiritual should restore him in a spirit of gentleness. Look to yourself, lest you too be tempted. Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. For if any one thinks he is something, when he is nothing, he deceives himself. 6:1-3 RSV

The motive of self-preservation gives strength to the forcefulness of the final warning in this letter.

> Do not be deceived; God is not mocked, for whatever a man sows, that he will also reap. For he who sows to his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption; but he who sows to the Spirit will from the Spirit reap eternal life. And let us not grow weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we do not lose heart. 6:7-9 RSV

In the closing sentence of the discourse (apart from the benediction) we have a dramatic example of a thought so expressed as to be likely to have strong emotional impact on the hearers. "Henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear on my body the marks of Jesus." 6:17 RSV He does not merely say "Don't worry me, for I belong to Christ." Instead a metaphor is chosen that would most certainly arouse the memories of the Apostle's own sufferings in his missionary adventures, and also memories which were the most sacred of all, those concerning Calvary. This reference to the ownership brand on slaves, and to the stigmata, is further explained in the section on Ethos.

Analysis of Ethos

It seems characteristic of the Pauline addresses that ethical proof is markedly present. So much is this the case that we doubt whether any more than a very small percentage of contemporary public speaking reveals an approximate emphasis. It may be that the study of Paul's speaking has most to offer us in the area of ethos. The significance for today of this mark of Pauline oratory is discussed in the Conclusion of this dissertation.

Considering first the arguments which have bearing upon Paul's character,[1] we would inquire--did Paul "associate either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated?"

There are over eighty references to the Godhead in these six chapters. The first verse and the last, and practically every paragraph in between links the arguments of Paul with the sacred name. The venerated Scriptures are made to give support to the Apostle's argument throughout. Seven times in a single chapter Paul quotes from the Old Testament in support of his contentions. Twelve times the gospel

---

[1]See pages 296-303.

itself is named. His relationship with the twelve Apostles is used to demonstrate his integrity, and the frequent mention of Abraham ministers to the acceptance of Paul's argument concerning the Law. It is stated that the essence of his message is "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Thus there would seem to be adequate indications that Paul associated both himself and his message with what is "virtuous and elevated."

Does Paul "bestow, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause?" The six arguments of the first two chapters establishing his apostleship could be considered as praise regarding himself. This praise is not always "tempered" if we understand the latter in the sense of mitigation. Inasmuch as the self-praise in this case is not incidental but rather required by the circumstances, the reason for what otherwise might be considered extravagance can be seen. The response of someone whose character has been attacked will usually contain more self-recommendation than would otherwise be the case. In this case, however, a close examination of Paul's efforts to vindicate himself reveal that he displayed true humility beneath apparently extravagant claims. Thus while he would seem to boast concerning the great change that had taken place in his life at conversion, he is careful to give God the credit for this change.

> For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it: and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers. But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me. . . . Gal 1:13-16

Similarly when he "boasts" about the joy of the Christian churches in Judaea over his conversion he is careful to add: "And they glorified God in me." 1:24 Thus God, not Paul, is given the credit for the amazing transformation in the life of the persecutor.

In the heart of the letter he makes reference to the great affection which the Galatians had entertained for him at his first visit. This is a kind of two-way praise, extending both to the Galatians and himself. ". . . I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me." 4:15 Such love for the Apostle, it is implied, must have had sufficient cause. Immediately before his farewell benediction, Paul uttered a unique claim for himself which is full of ethical appeal. "From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." 6:17. What does he mean by this strange allusion to the "marks" of Christ? The historical impact of this expression can be seen in the records of the numerous individuals who have claimed to have received Ta stigmata, the scars of the cross, in their own person. St. Francis of Assisi is a case in point.

Catholic scholars claim that this expression of Paul's took such a strong hold upon the mind of St. Francis that the very marks of the Passion seemed to manifest themselves upon his body. This is here referred to only as indicating the striking nature of Paul's expression. The historical antecedents of the figure are not hard to trace. Temple slaves, such as those engaged in the worship of Cybele, were branded with signs that indicated their attachment to a certain deity. Paul claims that the physical scars of his missionary sufferings are evidence that he has shared the cross of Christ. Coming as it does immediately after his final appeal to the Galatians to obey his gospel, this allusion is rich in ethical poignancy.

> The Apostle has done. He will not dally with these vexatious attacks upon himself and his authority any more. He dismisses them with an appeal which ought to be final. He points to the scars of wounds which he had received in his Master's service. The branding-irons of Christ, he says have imprinted these upon me. They show that I, like the slaves of a heathen temple, am

> devoted and consecrated to His service. They are my credentials, and I shall produce no others. My assailants must leave me in peace.[1]

Does Paul "link the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous?" The following are some of the allusions made concerning the Judaizers at Galatia. They not only suggest that the cause of Paul's opponents is not virtuous but that the result of adhering to it could be eternal loss.

> I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. 1:6-9

> Have I then become your enemy by telling you the truth? They make much of you, but for no good purpose; they want to shut you out, that you may make much of them. 4:16, 17 RSV

> It is those who want to make a good showing in the flesh that would compel you to be circumcised, and only in order that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ. For even those who receive circumcision do not themselves keep the law, but they desire to have you circumcised that they may glory in your flesh. 6:12, 13 RSV

In the first verses, Paul emphatically declares that the teachings of the Judaizers do not constitute a true gospel. The Greek word translated "pervert" is actually stronger and means "change to its very opposite." Also the term translated "accursed" in this same passage is literally "Anathema." Paul thus declares that those who dared to turn the gospel into an entirely false creed are under the curse of God.

The second passage casts aspersion on the motives of the schismatics. Paul suggests that it is the desire of these proponents of

---

[1]Sanday, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 463.

a false gospel to separate the Galatians from the remainder of Gentile churches in order that they, the Judaizers, might bear complete rule over them.

In the final passage, Paul points out that another reason for the stress of these new teachers on the Law was in order, that they might avoid the opposition of non-Christian Jews.

> It is trouble for themselves that they wish to avoid. Themselves members of the orthodox Jewish community, different from other Jews only in that they accepted Jesus as the expected Messiah, they wish to remain in good standing in the Jewish community, and to that end wish to be able to point to converts from the Gentile world who have not merely accepted Jesus as the Christ, but have also conformed to those physical requirements of the Jewish law which from the Jewish point of view were vital, but to Paul purely external and physical.[1]

Also, these men in reality do not fully obey the Law of which they make so much, adds the Apostle. He has before pointed out that it is impossible for imperfect human beings to keep a perfect law, and now he affirms that this is particularly true of those who broke the first and great commandment of love by their self-seeking.

Over and against the Judaizing position condemned in 6:12, 13, Paul sets the contrast of his own stand.

> But far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world. For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. Peace and mercy be upon all who walk by this rule, upon the Israel of God.
>
> Gal 6:14-16 RSV

This statement, by its concise picture of true religion, disparages the distortion of the opponents more than any lengthy philippic could do. It would certainly seem that Paul "links the opponent and the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous."

---

[1]Burton, pp. 349-350.

Has Paul "removed or minimized unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponents"? We have already noticed that such was the purpose of the first two chapters of this letter. The new teachers had disparaged Paul's claim to apostleship. To establish this claim as well as he was able, the Apostle replied with evidences from various phases of his career, evidences which indicated his authority as a chosen messenger of God. In addition to this, the closely woven arguments of the rest of the epistle spoke for the ability of the maligned missionary. Thirdly, the epistle was stamped with indications of the absolute sincerity of the original founder of the Galatian church. The following is an example.

> For a good purpose it is always good to be made much of, and not only when I am present with you. My little children, with whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you! I could wish to be present with you now and to change my tone, for I am perplexed about you. 4:18-20 RSV

By these manifestations Paul hoped "to remove or minimize unfavorable impressions," and simultaneously he fulfilled the remaining criteria suggested by Thonssen and Baird in this regard, namely "the replying upon authority derived from personal experience," and "creating the impression of being completely sincere."

So much then for the indications in the epistle to the Galatians of the probity of Paul's character. What can be said concerning the indications of his "competence"?

As a professed teacher of the Gospel, Paul's competence would best be indicated by his revelation of a thorough knowledge of the ways and purposes of God. As one who professed to be an agent in fulfilling the Old Testament Scriptures, it would be necessary that he possess an extraordinary understanding of these writings as revealed by his logical and apt interpretations of the same. Thus all that has been said under "analysis of ideas" applies here. It is in Paul's perception of the true

nature of Christianity, his emphasis upon being rather than doing, his description of the genuine Christian life as one enshrining love, joy, peace, etc., that his competence is manifested. The skillful use of the sacred writings to prove each major point is another indication of this. Not the least of the signs of his competence is the fact that the major exponents of the Christian religion have ever recognized in this epistle a concise summary of the nature of Christianity.

It is, however, in the first two chapters of this epistle that we have presented to us particular and direct evidence concerning the "competence" of Paul.[1] It is here that he replies to criticism regarding the origin and worth of his teaching. We find hints scattered through this passage, intimating the nature of the specific criticisms made by his opponents regarding Paul's competence as a teacher.

Apparently it had been asserted that Paul was a mere evangelist who had been instructed by the Twelve Apostles, and who had now turned against his teachers to proclaim a gospel of his own. Also "he had clearly been reproached with an obsequious disposition, a tendency to accommodate himself to the tastes and thoughts of those with whom he had to do."[2]

In response to such accusations, the Apostle declares in his opening remark that he is "an apostle--not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father. . ." v 1 RSV He proceeds by pointing out that there is only one gospel, and that this gospel is enshrined in the message which he had preached to them.

> I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ and turning to a different gospel--not that there is another gospel, but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an

---

[1]See pages 296-303.

[2]F. Godet, Introduction to the New Testament, translated by W. Affleck (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1899), p. 190.

> angel of heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. vs 6-8 RSV

Thus Paul endeavors to turn the tables on his traducers. They have asserted that his gospel is one of his own devising and therefore not the genuine message of Christ. He replies that it was his preaching which providence had used to call the Galatians. The intimation is that if the message which led to their conversion was false, they are not truly converted. On the other hand, the words infer that if the gospel they first received was genuine, that which was offered by the Judaizers must be counterfeit.

The Apostle continues his apologia with rhetorical questions, and with direct assertion.

> Am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I trying to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ.
>
> For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ. For you have heard of my former life in Judaism, how I persecuted the church of God violently and tried to destroy it; and I advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers. But when he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I did not confer with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned to Damascus. 1:10-17 RSV

The argument implicit in this passage is that "if it was human glory or approbation he was seeking, he would not have become the servant of a crucified One, to be everywhere reviled, everywhere persecuted like Him. The path of honour was open to him among his people. Why then did he renounce it, and choose that of shame?"[1]

---

[1]Godet, pp. 190-191.

He further points out that he had known no immediate contact with the "official" Apostles. Instead, he retired to Arabia, where he preached the gospel received from Christ. On his subsequent return to Damascus, this ministry of preaching had been continued, and all this without any "training" from Church leaders.

> Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and remained with him fifteen days. But I saw none of the other apostles except James the Lord's brother. (In what I am writing to you, before God, I do not lie!)[1] Then I went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. And I was still not known by sight to the churches of Christ in Judea; they only heard it said "He who once persecuted us is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy." And they glorified God because of me. 1:18-24 RSV

In these words the Apostle reviews his whole contact with the apostolic church in Palestine. He affirms before God that what he writes is true. In substance, he asserts that his contact with the Apostles had been too brief and fragmentary for him to have been instructed as a catechumen by them. Furthermore, the association with the church in Palestine had been entirely cordial, for the believers had glorified God concerning his new stand.

In the following chapter Paul, in his attempt to establish his independent apostleship, offers two more significant facts regarding his career. Verses one to ten describe the conference at Jerusalem attended by Paul fourteen years after the events described in the preceding chapter. The narrative of this conference indicates that the Apostles there gathered together had recognized the authority of Paul as equal to their own. They had extended to him "the right hand of fellowship." In addition to this, according to Paul, they had recognized that his ministry pertained to the Gentile world, and that this ministry should

---

[1]In the midst of this argument concerning his competence, we find this parenthesis with reference to another aspect of ethos--virtue. He affirms solemnly his truthfulness.

be prosecuted without requiring of converts the ceremonial observances of Judaism such as circumcision. The second significant fact in this chapter is that a test case of his authority had arisen in the dispute with Peter, with the result that the "new" Apostle had occasion to correct the Apostle of long standing, (see verses 11-21). When the prominence of Peter in the early church is considered, it becomes evident how powerful an argument is Paul's reference to his rebuke of that Apostle.

Thus in these first two chapters of his address, Paul has employed what still seem to be powerful and cogent arguments regarding his personal authority. One writer has aptly summarised the nature of the transition which now takes place in the letter.

> The question of the apostolic authority of Paul is now settled, but it is as yet only a question of competence, that is to say, of form. We must go to the foundation of the doctrine preached by him, and examine its intrinsic truth. But what shall be the judge? The Scripture is here; that is what is invoked against Paul; the law, his adversaries say, is established for ever, it is stable as the heavens themselves. By what right does he claim to abrogate the institution to which Jesus himself submitted, and which the apostles still maintain?--The right of the Scripture itself, St. Paul boldly replies, and this he proceeds to set forth in the second part of his letter (chs. iii and iv.).[1]

As pointed out elsewhere, it is this masterly and adroit use of Scripture which further seals the competency of the maligned Apostle.

We turn to the third constituent of ethical proof, evidence of the good-will of the speaker. Some of the key verses that have bearing on this are here repeated.

> Brethren, I beseech you, become as I am, for I also have become as you are. You did me no wrong; you know it was because of a bodily ailment that I preached the gospel to you at first; and though my condition was a trial to you, you did not scorn or

---

[1]Godet, p. 204.

> despise me, but received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus. What has become of the satisfaction you felt? For I bear you witness that, if possible, you would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me. Have I then become your enemy by telling you the truth? . . . My little children, with whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you! I could wish to be present with you now and to change my tone, for I am perplexed about you. Gal 4:12-20 RSV

In this passage the Apostle not only pours out his own vehement desire towards them but he refers to the affectionate attitude which had formerly characterized the relationship between these new converts and himself. It is evident that the thought of their former demonstrations of love remained for him as a very precious memory. By thus dwelling upon this former amiable association, Paul indicates that it is his desire that such interchange of affection should ever be maintained. Lovingly, he calls these backsliders "my little children."

There is another passage in this letter which at first sight might appear to contradict the indications of the Apostle's love for his converts. In conveying good-will it is not usual to accuse our hearers of foolishness. But Paul does so repeatedly in the following passage.

> O foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified? Let me ask you only this: Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law, or by hearing with faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun with the Spirit, are you now ending with the flesh? Did you experience so many things in vain? Gal 3:1-4 RSV

While obviously stern in character, even this passage contains indications of Paul's love. He almost palliates their mistake by suggesting that surely someone must have cast a bewitching spell over them. Considered in the context of the whole letter, probably these verses should be viewed as the anxious and grieved expression of a spiritual father over his erring children. Had he no feelings of love towards them, their dereliction could not trouble him half so much.

In this consideration of the third classical ingredient of ethos, namely goodwill, we would suggest that another term should also find its place under this heading. This term is empathy. The power of projecting one's personality to the audience and the evidencing of sympathetic comprehension of its ideals and aims is no small asset to an orator. The day may well come when the "goodwill" of Aristotle will be interpreted as including empathy when the former is considered at its best. This capacity distinguished the Apostle in all his efforts at communication.

Not only in Galatians but in each epistle there are strong indications that Paul projected himself into the situation and feelings of his auditors. Over and above this aspect is his empathy for mankind in general. He speaks as one who feels the pulse-beat of all men. Conflict and suffering, peace and health, poverty and prosperity, pain and joy--to none of these is he a stranger. He has entered richly into the distinctive experiences of the race, and has the extraordinary ability of making vocal the feelings that accompany such experiences. The themes with which he grapples are never petty. They comprehend massive concepts each of which is vitally related to the life of every man. For example, here in Galatians, Paul does not narrow down the issue to the practice or non-practice of circumcision. He sees this situation as representative of the conflict between true and false religion. He soars beyond the discussion of a formal rite to the contrasting descriptions of the life of bondage, and the life of liberty. In the soul of every man is the longing for liberty, Paul believes. This liberty is not just civil or national, it is spiritual. Man longs to rule himself and thus be free, but the universal experience is subservience to what the Apostle calls "the spirit of bondage," the control of "the works of the flesh." Thus the frequent emphasis upon the thought of

liberty in this letter. Paul declares that true freedom is the result of entire surrender to Christ. In such ways does the missionary orator appeal to the basic hungers of men. In so doing he does not lose himself in the clouds of ethereal idealism. An example of this fact is found in the heart of his discussion regarding liberty. After pointing out that man's true nature finds liberation only in Christ he proceeds to show that even the Christian will continue to know the temptations, though not the domination, of the flesh.

> For you were called to freedom, brethren; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself." But if you bite and devour one another take heed that you are not consumed by one another.
>
> But I say, walk by the Spirit, and do not gratify the desires of the flesh. For the desires of the flesh are against the Spirit, and the desires of the Spirit are against the flesh; for these are opposed to each other, to prevent you from doing what you would.
>
> Gal 5:13-17 RSV

Thus Paul pictures even the man who has been made free as being still subject to the troublesome "desires of the flesh." The Apostle is no impractical visionary conjuring up the ecstatic ideal of a Christian as one who is always in the ecstasy of holiness beyond the taint of evil desire. The description is much more realistic, and in harmony with the experience of those to whom he speaks. This is empathy. His analysis of the spirit of man is so accurate that such allusions probably opened the hearts and minds of his hearers to receive his message.

There is evidence of empathy in a passage that follows closely upon the above.

> Brethren, if a man is overtaken in any trespass, you who are spiritual should restore him in a spirit of gentleness. Look to yourself, lest you too be tempted. Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. For if any one thinks he is something, when he is nothing, he deceives himself. 6:1-3 RSV

By these words Paul gives recognition to the fact that men constantly fall short of their ideals. Believers also are "overtaken in trespasses." Furthermore those who consider that they themselves are without spot are likely to err by virtue of this self-confidence. It is "you who are spiritual" that are admonished "look to yourself, lest you too be tempted . . . For if any one thinks he is something, when he is nothing, he deceives himself." By implication the Apostle is saying that human nature is encompassed with weaknesses of which most men are not cognizant. Just at the time when a new believer thinks he is doing fine, he is likely to err by pride or censoriousness or sudden lapse into "the works of the flesh." Coincident with this psychological insight is Paul's manifestation of intense sympathy with his fellow human beings. He spends more time warning the self-righteous than admonishing the one "overtaken in a trespass." His heart is evidently towards "the lost sheep," and he is anxious that an attitude of rejection should not further discourage the erring believer. This too reveals empathy. It demonstrates that Paul has known the experiences to which he alludes, and that his warning is directed at himself also, keeping him on the same level as those he addresses.

When L. H. Mouat speaks concerning "Identification" in his "Approach to Rhetorical Criticism" he uses a broad term that includes this thought of empathy.

> If the many rhetorical concepts that produce effectiveness, as well as the area of effectiveness, can be reduced and simplified, and if we can approach an isomorphic, or one-to-one, relationship between the speaker and his speech, on the one hand, and the audience (area of effect), on the other, our search for a unifying medium of criticism will be ended. We now propose that the common denominator of rhetorical concepts that produce effectiveness may be conceived of as a form of identification, as defined by Kenneth Burke, and that an isomorphic relationship can be established between societal orders and methods of identification.

> Burke explains as follows: "You persuade man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your way with his." The term "identification" includes the art of employing topics in such a way that one's proposals are identified with the beliefs and desires of the audience and counterproposals with their aversions, but it is also more extensive and more intensive than this. Burke would have identification extend beyond the scope of persuasion to instruction, to inspiration, and even to delectation for its own sake. . . .
>
> Identification is a process of becoming "substantially one" with an audience. It is an attempt to proclaim a unity among men at odds with one another. "If men were not apart from one another there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity. If men were wholly and truly of one substance, absolute communication would be of man's very essence."[1] (emphasis his)

Analysis of Arrangement

> In its broadest sense, disposition embraces the following matters: the emergence of a central theme, the general method of arrangement adopted for the speech, and the order in which the parts of the discourse are developed.[2]

Concerning the central theme, enough has already been said. Paul's concern is to show that spiritual liberty and acceptance with God is the result of a living union with Christ through faith. This stands in contrast to the formalized, religion of externals as recommended by what Paul would denominate as "the natural man," who in this case is represented by the Judaizers. This theme is found in every chapter of the letter, and all other ideas are made to minister to it. The minor themes of the purpose and place of the Law, and the Gentile Missionary's claim to Apostleship, are both integrally related to the major theme.

---

[1]L. H. Mouat, "Approach to Rhetorical Criticism," The Rhetorical Idiom, edited by Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 171-172.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, p. 393.

As regards the method of arrangement, there is no single one. The historical, distributive, and logical methods are employed.[1] In the first two chapters which argue the issue of Paul's Apostleship in terms of the highlights of his experience, the historical method is found. In the last four chapters we have both the distributive and the logical methods intermingled as the contrasting implications of legalism and the gospel are drawn out.

There are three main sections to the epistle, each consisting of two chapters; and the order is first personal, secondly doctrinal and thirdly hortatory. It should be mentioned that this is a logical order of arrangement, inasmuch as doctrinal discussion needs to be prefaced by personal authority of some kind, and also because exhortation must have for its foundation certain proved facts of doctrine.

The introduction is abrupt and startling. It is calculated to warn rather than to woo. Its very direct manner, however, was probably effective in compelling attention; and certainly the purpose of the following discourse was clearly stated.

The authoritative rebuke that is found in the introduction would constitute a poor beginning from any person who was a stranger to the Galatians, or from one who had no strong bond of affection between himself and this church. Considered, however, as the chastisement of a spiritual father, it is by no means out of place. It is doubtful whether

---

[1]"According to the historical basis of division, material is arranged in chronological order. . . .

According to the distributive method of arrangement, matters having a common thought center and an obvious connection among themselves are grouped in certain sections. . . .

Finally, the logical order may characterize the basis of division. In such cases, the arrangement of materials is determined by the continuity of the reasoning process; materials are placed at those points where they serve as links in the uninterrupted sequences or chains of thought." Thonssen and Baird, pp. 394-395.

any other kind of introduction under these circumstances would have served as well.

> This opening salutation is intentionally abrupt and bare. Usually it was the Apostle's custom to begin with words of commendation. He praises all that he can find to praise even in a Church that had offended so seriously as the Corinthians. (See 1 Cor 1:2, 4-7.) But the errors of the Galatians, he feels, go more to the root of things. The Corinthians had failed in the practical application of Christian principles; the Galatians (so far as they listened to their Judaising teachers) could hardly be said to have Christian principles at all. The Apostle is angry with them with a righteous indignation, and his anger is seen in the naked severity of this address.[1]

Paul was probably aware that the heat of forest fires sometimes succeeds in causing seeds to sprout where the genial rays of the sun have failed. On some such principle he is more direct and abrupt at the opening of this letter than of any other. As the discourse proceeds, however, the evidences of his great affection for the believers shines like sunshine through the clouds of rebuke.

The body of the address is more closely knit than is the case with either of the letters to the Corinthians. Here digressions are few, and one argument follows another. The spirit of leisure is missing, and instead the tone is urgent and compelling. This also was appropriate in order to confront the situation of apostasy in Galatia. Like the introduction, the conclusion is abrupt and incisive. "For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. Peace and mercy be upon all who walk by this rule, upon the Israel of God. Henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear on my body the marks of Jesus. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen." There is no lengthy list of personal greetings to

---

[1]Sanday, Ellicott, Vol. VII, p. 427.

church members such as we find in Romans, and to a lesser extent in other epistles. The Apostle thus intimates the urgency for immediate repentance and reformation before the former complete cordiality can find once more its free expression. It could be said concerning the concluding seven verses that their purpose included the "inspiring of the audience with a favorable opinion of Paul (who bore the stigmata); an unfavorable one of his adversaries (who are described here as glorying in externals); the providing of an amplification of the theme (vs 15, 16); the exciting of the emotions of the Galatians (v 17 especially); and the recalling of facts to their memory (vs 12-15)."[1]

Style

Most of the remarks on Paul's style are reserved for a separate chapter. A few things, however, should here be mentioned. First of all, there is an evident contrast between the style of Galatians and that of 1 Corinthians, although both letters rebuke churches in danger of backsliding. To the Corinthians the Apostle had written with a sympathetic tenderness which took into account the many environmental pressures to which the believers in that "Vanity Fair" were subjected. His rebukes had been greatly tempered, recognizing the constitutional weaknesses of those who had spent their lives in the unrestrained ways of dissolute paganism. Immediately we turn to the letter to the Galatians we are struck with the abruptness and severity of its tone. The "kid gloves" have been removed, for the Galatians could not claim the extenuating circumstances which partly excused the Corinthians. Furthermore, the urgency of the situation was greater because the Galatians were nearer to apostasy than the believers at Corinth.

---

[1]Aristotle, The Rhetoric, Book iii, p. 19, quoted by Thonssen and Baird, p. 398.

Sharpness of tone was necessary to shock the former into a realization of their peril. The same sharpness as pursued throughout the message to the Galatians may have had for the Corinthians, if so addressed, the effect of discouragement. We discern in this difference of style "a willingness to adopt . . . to a particular set of circumstances."[1]

Secondly, the style of Galatians is the style of the diatribe. It "is characterized by quotation from past or anticipated objectors and rapid fire answer to them."[2] This style was prominent in the first century of this era, and is further exemplified by another letter in the New Testament, the Epistle of James.

The fact that Galatians is composed in the form of a diatribe explains the existence of a number of abrupt transitions such as 1:10, 11; 5:25; 5:12 and 6:7, 15. It is as though the Apostle were actually surveying his audience, and occasionally spies some antagonist, or catches the cry of an objector. He thereupon cuts short his remarks on the present subject, and addresses himself to an issue which he suspects is being questioned, or casts some verbal dart he considers appropriate.

In a few cases, as has been mentioned earlier, there are sentences which are involved or cut short. Examples of curtailment can be found in 2:3-5; 4:14; 4:24.

> So rich was the treasure of Paul's life in Christ that he never found it easy to put it into words, least of all in Galatians. Although the epistle was composed neither carelessly nor hastily, the anxiety and emotional stress under which Paul dictated his cascading thoughts have produced some involved and obscure sentences.[3]

This quotation should not be understood as implying that Paul's resources of language were in any way inadequate. The difficulty was

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 430.

[2]Stamm, Interpreter's Bible, v. 10, p. 442.

[3]Ibid.

that on some occasions his fertile brain spawned ideas with greater rapidity than it could verbalize them.

On the whole, however, Paul's style was effective, including as its components "(1) an idea worth presenting, (2) an unmistakably clear conception of the idea, (3) a desire to communicate it, (4) a willingness to adapt it to a particular set of circumstances, and (5) a mastery of language adequate to express the idea in words."[1]

Results

There is no way of ascertaining what were the immediate effects of the letter to the Galatians. However, the long range effects upon the early Christian church are traceable to some degree. Farrar has summed up excellently the evidence of the first two centuries in this regard.

> What was the effect of the Epistle on the Churches of Galatia we cannot tell; but for the Church of Christ the work was done. By this letter Gentiles were freed for ever from the peril of having their Christianity subjected to impossible and carnal conditions. In the Epistle to the Romans circumcision does not occur as a practical question. Judaism continued, indeed, for some time to exercise over Christianity a powerful influence, but in the Epistle of Barnabas circumcision is treated with contempt, and even attributed to the deception of an evil angel; in the Epistle of Ignatius, St Paul's distinction of the true and false circumcision is absolutely accepted; and even in the Clementine Homilies, Judaistic as they are, not a word is said of the necessity of circumcision, but he who desires to be un-Hellenised must be so by baptism and the new birth.[2]

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 430.

[2]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 443.

VI. THE DISCOURSE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

It is the most beautiful of all Paul's letters.[1]

With passages full of elegant negligence (1:29), like Plato's dialogues, and Cicero's letters, it has passages of wonderful eloquence, and proceeds from entirely outward, special, relations and circumstances to wide-reaching thoughts and grand conceptions.[2]

His letter is like one of those magnificant pieces of music which, amid all its stormy fugues and mighty discords, is dominated by some inner note of triumph which at last bursts forth into irresistible and glorious victory. . . [yet] The letter was dictated by a worn and fettered Jew, the victim of gross perjury, and the prey of contending enmities; dictated by a man of feeble frame, in afflicted circumstances, vexed with hundreds of opponents, and with scarce one friend to give him consolation.[3]

The Occasion

The City and the Church of Philippi

Philippi was the most easterly of the Roman cities in the province of Macedonia. It was situated on a highway which stretched from Dyrrachium on the Adriatic to the Hellespont. By virtue of this position on the Egnatian Road, the city was frequented by citizens of all lands. It had become in Paul's day a meeting-place of East and West.

The city of Philippi was a monumental record of two vast empires. It had once been an obscure place, called Krenides from its streams and springs; but Philip, the father of Alexander, had made it a frontier town, to protect Macedonia from the Thracians,

---

[1]The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 10, p. 12.

[2]Braune, cited in Lange's Commentary, Vol. 22, p. 4.

[3]Farrar, Messages, p. 303.

> and had helped to establish his power by the extremely profitable working of its neighboring gold mines. Augustus, proud of the victory over Brutus and Cassius, --won at the foot of the hill on which it stands, and on the summit of which Cassius had committed suicide, --elevated it to the rank of a colony, which made it, as St. Luke calls it, if not the first yet certainly "a first city of that district of Macedonia."[1]

Cities of Roman provinces were either municipia (free towns) or coloniae (colonies). The latter enjoyed peculiar privileges chief of which was (in most cases) the exemption from taxation of landed property. The colonies were miniatures of Rome itself, and the inhabitants were Roman citizens with the right of franchise. Not by the governor of the province, but by their own senate and magistrates were such communities governed. Usually the Roman law and the Latin language prevailed in the coloniaea.

In Paul's day, at Philippi "the population was composed of three main elements. First, there were the Roman colonists, the dominant caste; then there were the native Macedonians, numerically the strongest section; and finally there was a considerable admixture of Orientals. . . ."[2] Probably because there was little in the way of commerce at Philippi, the number of resident Jews was small.

In view of its strategic position in Europe, Philippi became the site for initial missionary endeavour by the early church. The story of this beginning is found in the sixteenth chapter of Acts. The author of the record claims that Paul in a vision saw "a man of Macedonia. . . beseeching him and saying, "Come over to Macedonia and help us." Acts 16:9 RSV The narrative continues: "And when he had seen the vision, immediately we sought to go on into Macedonia, concluding

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 274.

[2]David Smith, p. 127.

that God had called us to preach the gospel to them" v 10 RSV Thus Philippi became the temporary home of the one called to be the Apostle to the Gentiles.

On a Sabbath morning Paul, Silas, Timothy and Luke, repaired to a secluded nook on the river-bank, where it was reported a few Jews gathered weekly for worship. Apparently there was no synagogue in the city, because of the paucity of Jewish believers. To their surprise the evangelists found women only in the little assemblage. Paul preached nevertheless, and gained a notable convert in Lydia, "from the city of Thyatira, a seller of purple goods." v 14 RSV Apparently this woman was a Gentile who had become a proselyte to Judaism. She seems to have been prosperous, for the narration indicates that she owned a commodious residence to which she invited the new teachers. Lydia was Christianity's first convert in Europe. Probably her home became the meeting place of the growing church.

The next group of converts was won more dramatically than the first. When making their way to a prayer-meeting, Paul and Silas were followed by a slave-girl who served her masters as a fortune teller. Possibly this girl was afflicted with epileptic diathesis which was one of the qualifications for a Pythoness of Delphi.[1] On this occasion she pursued the missionaries, calling out vigorously so as to attract the attention of bystanders to herself, Paul, and Silas. This behaviour continued for days until the patient spirit of Paul gave way. Turning around, the Apostle administered a sharp rebuke. The wild, unnatural screaming ceased, and such a transformation seemed to take place in the slave-girl that her masters decided she was of no further use to them as a source of income by divination. The results are described by Luke as follows.

---

[1]The feminine diviners of Delphi were called pythonesses after the Pythian Apollo.

But when her owners saw that their hope of gain was gone, they seized Paul and Silas and dragged them into the market place before the rulers; and when they had brought them to the magistrates they said, "These men are Jews and they are disturbing our city. They advocate customs which it is not lawful for us Romans to accept or practice." The crowd joined in attacking them; and the magistrates tore the garments off them and gave orders to beat them with rods. And when they had inflicted many blows upon them, they threw them into prison, charging the jailer to keep them safely. Having received this charge, he put them into the inner prison and fastened their feet in the stocks.

But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns to God, and the prisoners were listening to them, and suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened and every one's fetters were unfastened. When the jailer woke and saw that the prison doors were open, he drew his sword and was about to kill himself, supposing that the prisoners had escaped. But Paul cried with a loud voice, "Do not harm yourself, for we are all here." And he called for lights and rushed in, and trembling with fear he fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out and said, "Men, what must I do to be saved, ?" And they said, "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved, you and your household." And they spoke the word of the Lord to him and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their wounds, and he was baptized at once, with all his family. Then he brought them up into his house, and set food before them; and he rejoiced with all his household that he had believed in God.

But when it was day, the magistrates sent the police, saying, "Let those men go." And the jailer reported the words to Paul, saying, "The magistrates have sent to let you go; now therefore come out and go in peace." But Paul said to them, "They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men who are Roman citizens, and have thrown us into prison; and do they now cast us out secretly? No! let them come themselves and take us out." The police reported these words to the magistrates, and they were afraid when they heard that they were Roman citizens; so they came and apologized to them. And they took them out and asked them to leave the city. So they went out of the prison, and visited Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they exhorted them and departed. Acts 16:19-40 RSV

These events took place about the end of 52 A.D. The nucleus of believers was left to its own resources while the Apostle preached in other cities, and it was not until five years later that he was able to visit them again (Acts 20:1). The third visit took place after the tumult at Ephesus. On this occasion Paul was specially engaged in the collection for the poverty-stricken believers at Jerusalem. According to his statement to the Corinthians (2 Cor 8:1-5), he found the Christians at Philippi not only willing to give their goods but also to give themselves for the work of the gospel. This would have been in 58 A.D. The final visit was made in the spring of the following year on the way to Jerusalem. Judging from the documents extant, there was no church as endeared to Paul as this one at Philippi. He calls it "his joy and crown" Phil 4:1.

Paul's Circumstances at the Time of the Writing of This Epistle

The last eight chapters of the book of Acts describe the adventures of Paul between the time of his last visit to Philippi and his letter to them from a Roman prison.

While at Jerusalem, he had been taken into custody by Roman soldiers as the result of a Jewish riot and accusations made by his own countrymen. After many delays, including a lengthy imprisonment at Caesarea, the Apostle was taken to Rome for trial. His arrival in this city was probably in the spring of 56 A.D., during the reign of Nero. In the subsequent term of two years' imprisonment he wrote Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians.

Some knowledge of the local church at Rome is necessary in order to understand fully the significance of certain passages in the letters written from that city. The Christian congregation at the heart of the

Empire did not owe its origin to Paul. The early stages of its development are nowhere chronicled, but scholars believe it was probably established by converts to Christianity who had been sojourners in Jerusalem at the time of Pentecost. Judging from the epistle to the Romans, which was written three or four years before Paul's arrival in that city, the local church was significant in either numbers or influence. The long list of salutations at the end of Romans infers this. Both Jews and Gentiles were in the church, but the latter predominated.

Within three days of Paul's arrival at Rome, he resumed evangelistic work. The praetorian prefect, apparently kindly disposed, permitted the prisoner to occupy a lodging of his own under the charge of a Roman soldier. His friends and other visitors were permitted free access to him for at least the first part of his captivity. Luke's record reads as follows:

> And when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard: but Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him. And it came to pass, that after three days Paul called the chief of the Jews together. . . . And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.
>
> Acts 28:16, 17, 23

According to the letter we are now studying, this zeal of Paul's was not without fruit. His imprisonment "turned out" to the great "furtherance of the gospel."

> But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear. Phil 1:12-14

Converts were made in Caesar's own household, and among the Praetorian guard. The Roman believers, stirred by such an example, proved more diligent in their own proclamation of the Christian message. Among them, however, there existed some measure of Jewish-Gentile dissension. Thus Paul's declaration that some were preaching Christ with contention, "not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds." 1:16 One result of this partisanship was that the pressing needs of the aged prisoner seem to have slipped out of sight. There is no evidence that the Roman believers contributed to his support. Paul sadly writes to the Philippians that "all seek their own interests." 2:21 (orig.)

> The Apostle was in sore need. He was not indeed actually destitute, for he had been well furnished by the liberality of the people of Melita; but he had to meet the expense of his rental and maintenance at Rome, nor was he permitted to go abroad and earn a wage by plying his craft of tent-making. And he was a stranger in the vast Metropolis. The Church there was not his foundation. Its members were bound to him by no ties of gratitude and affection, and the converts whom he had won since his arrival belonged to the poorer order--soldiers of the Praetorian Guard and slaves of the imperial household. They could afford him nothing. His little store was fast dwindling, and unless he were brought speedily to trial he must be destitute.[1]

Occasion and Purpose of the Epistle

We do not know how word of the Apostle's plight reached the church at Philippi. Possibly Luke had journeyed to that district. Some commentators believe that the "true yokefellow" referred to in the last chapter of the letter was "the beloved physician." Upon receipt of the news, the Philippians raised a generous sum of money and sent it with Epaphroditus to Rome. On seeing the plight of the Apostle, Epaphroditus

---

[1]David Smith, p. 508.

decided to remain and minister to the needs of Paul. According to Horace,[1] autumn was not a salubrious season at Rome, and it may have been during this season that the messenger from Philippi became dangerously ill. While he was convalescing, a message arrived from the believers at his home-church anxiously inquiring about himself and Paul. Epaphroditus decided to return to Philippi, and to take with him a message dictated by the Apostle.

It is obvious that the purpose of Paul's message would include thanksgiving for the Philippian gift, and the giving of news concerning his welfare. There is however, a far more important theme in his letter than either of these. From the report given him by Epaphroditus, Paul learned that his favorite church was threatened with certain dangers. In a church hitherto renowned for its harmony, certain animosities and cliques were incipient. There were some who were disputing over petty questions of precedence (1:27; 2:2-4), others were giving heed to visiting Judaizers (3:1-3), and two of the deaconesses had experienced a disagreement (4:2, 3). Even though noneof these failings had yet assumed any position of grave importance, and the majority of the Philippians were persevering in holy conduct, Paul foresaw the possibility of an approaching crisis. He was aware, that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor 5:6), and he desired to crush at their outset these threats to the unity and spiritual prosperity of the church in Macedonia. This is Paul's main purpose in his address to the Philippians.

A subsidiary purpose apparently entertained by the Apostle was to indicate the joyfulness of the true Christian life. These Christians had been mourning on his behalf, and also were anxious concerning

---

[1]Epist 1, vii, 1-9; David Smith, p. 509.

Epaphroditus. Paul wished lovingly to admonish them that they should "have no anxiety about anything" Phil 4:6 RSV, and that they should ever "rejoice" in the Lord." Phil 3:1

> The church at Philippi appears to have been one of the most pure and generous of that age. Its members showed the tenderest regard for Paul. Twice while he was at Thessalonica, and once when at Corinth, they had sent him contributions for his support, which he accepted, to prevent the gospel being burdensome to more recent converts (4:15, 16; 2 Cor 11:9). They had also cheerfully borne many sufferings for their adherence to the Saviour (1:28-30). Their conduct had been uniformly so exemplary that he had only to rejoice over them. Accordingly, in this epistle, he pours forth his heart in expressions of devout thankfulness and hearty commendations, not unmingled, however, with exhortations and counsel.[1]

Analysis of the Development of Ideas, with Emphasis Upon Logical Proof

Most of the ideas contained in this discourse could be placed in one of three groups whose respective headings would be, Unity, Joy, and Love. Certain words occur repeatedly, indicating the themes of the letter. For example the expression "you all," indicative of the thought of unity, is found eight times. In other epistles of similar length the average occurrence of this phrase is only twice. Similarly the words "joy" and "rejoice" occur seventeen times, more often by far than in any other epistle of Paul's.

Aware of the incipient threats to the harmony of the church at Philippi, the Apostle places most emphasis upon the idea of unity. We shall consider the main passages which relate to this theme.

> My desire is to depart and be with Christ . . . But to remain in the flesh is more necessary on your account. Convinced of this, I know that I shall remain and continue with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith. . . .

---

[1]Joseph Angus, The Bible Handbook. Revised by Samuel G. Green. (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1952), p. 719.

> Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ, so that whether I come and see you or am absent, I may hear of you that you stand firm in one spirit, with one mind striving side by side for the faith of the gospel, and not frightened in anything by your opponents. This is a clear omen to them of their destruction, but of your salvation, and that from God. For it has been granted to you that for the sake of Christ you should not only believe in him but also suffer for his sake, engaged in the same conflict which you saw and now hear to be mine. 1:23-30 RSV

Paul declares that he longs to finish his course that he might know the presence of Christ. Nevertheless, he is hoping to be released from imprisonment in order that he might be further used to aid the Christian growth of these believers. Having asserted this, he urges them unitedly to resist evil, whether he is able to come to them or not. The Greek word translated "manner of life" is literally "citizenship." Thus he infers: "You count it a privilege to be citizens of Rome, and subjects of Caesar. How much more important is it that you behave as citizens of heaven, and loyal subjects of Jesus Christ." Three times in one sentence the thought of unity is expressed by the terms "one spirit," "one mind," and "side by side." The words "striving side by side" constitute a metaphor associated with the Grecian games where athletes engaged in hand-to-hand contests. The verb is also employed with reference to contending in battle. Thus Paul likens the believers to warriors or athletes on the same side, unitedly repulsing the antagonists. Such unity and fearlessness will intimate to opposers that the Christians have God as their Helper. It is apparent from these verses that the church at Philippi had continued to share the persecution from unbelievers that had been the lot of the original missionaries in that city.

The preceding passage is Paul's plea for unity despite the opposition from outside the church. It is immediately succeeded by an appeal for unity despite troubles from within the church.

> So if there is any encouragement in Christ, any incentive of love, any participation in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy, complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind. Do nothing from selfishness or conceit, but in humility count others better than yourselves. Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others. Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross. Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. 2:1-11 RSV

Having previously hinted at the necessity for unity by his allusion to "one spirit" and "one soul," Paul now expands this by a direct exhortation to unity. Four times in a single sentence the thought is embodied by the phrases "the same mind," "the same love," "in full accord," and "of one mind." Such unity should be the logical outcome of the blessings believers share in Christ--this is the force of the parallel four-fold structure of the first verse. The next two verses express the negative and positive results of unity, respectively. Thus not only will nothing be done from motives of selfishness and conceit (v 3), but each will actively endeavour to assist his fellows (v 4). Then follows the greatest and most appropriate example Paul could possibly have cited, the example of Christ. Christ is pictured as existing in glory before His incarnation, in order to underline the depths of His condescension. This is emphasized still further by the expression "even death on a cross" which to contemporaries expressed the greatest possible shame and obloquy. To die on the cross was evidence that one was "accursed of God." (See Gal 3:13) It is not unreasonable that

Christians should humble themselves to serve their fellows, or to forego their "rights" for the sake of unity, Paul is saying. If the Lord and Master of Christians did this Himself, logically believers should follow His example. (This remarkable appeal based on the incarnation and death of Christ will be considered at greater length under pathetic proof.)

The words which follow in the text are a continuation of the theme of unity. They are linked to the preceding by "therefore."

> Therefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, so now, not only as in my presence but much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure. Do all things without grumbling or questioning, that you may be blameless and innocent, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom you shine as lights in the world, . . . 2:12-15

There is no direct rebuke to the church in this passage, nor in any part of the letter. But it is here implied that there were some members who threatened to disturb the prevailing harmony by their grumbling and by their expression of doubts. Paul calls upon them to "work out" the experience of salvation that has been begun in them by God. They are to engage in self-examination with "fear and trembling" for it is God, not man, with whom they have primarily to do. Furthermore, there is the witness of the church to the world to be considered, says Paul. Christians are called to be luminaries amid the prevailing darkness of paganism. How can believers fulfill this obligation unless they are at unity among themselves?

Paul has buttressed this chapter with powerful examples in order to show that the attitude of mind and heart for which he pleads is the natural and rational behaviour of every believer in God. He has already mentioned the example of Christ. Now he proceeds to indicate his own

readiness to serve to the end, and the similar disposition in his fellow worker Timothy. Following his plea that the Philippians might be true lights the Apostle adds:

> . . . so that in the day of Christ I may be proud that I did not run in vain or labor in vain. Even if I am to be poured as a libation upon the sacrificial offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all. . . .
>
> I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy to you soon, so that I may be cheered by news of you. I have no one like him, who will be genuinely anxious for your welfare. They all look after their own interests, not those of Jesus Christ. But Timothy's worth you know, how as a son with a father he has served with me in the gospel. 2:16-22 RSV

The examples of humility and service in Christ, Paul, and Timothy, belong to the realm of pathos as well as logos insofar as they constitute psychological appeal in addition to rational argument. We know little of Paul's manner of speech, if we fail to grasp the fact that though his mind is pre-eminently logical, pathetic and ethical appeals are inevitably tied to his argument. In this present case, the personal examples found in the lives of Christ, Timothy, and himself, represent the strongest of evidence regarding the nature of the genuine Christian life. Paul and Timothy had been the founders of the church at Philippi, and they had lived their gospel in addition to preaching it. The visual conceptions of the Philippians regarding a Christian had been shaped by the portrayal in the lives of their evangelists. The citing of such examples, therefore, was entirely appropriate in the argument of this discourse, and was likely to evoke suitable emotional reaction as well as mental assent.

In the following chapter, the Apostle discusses another threat to unity. This time the problem is not related to overt opposition from unbelievers (1:27-30), or from the faults of the local believers (2:14, 15).

The source of the trouble consists in the persons and teachings of the ubiquitous Judaizers.

> To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe. Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision. For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. 3:1-3

The context indicates that Judaizing Christians in the neighbourhood of Philippi were engaged in making a threefold attack upon the orthodox believers. These Gentile converts had been stigmatised as 'uncircumcised dogs.' (cf Deut 23:18; Mt 7:6; 15:26). Secondly, Paul had been assailed as to his teaching and authority, and thirdly, the familiar charge that the emphasis upon faith tended to relax moral obligation had been made. In response to the epithet first mentioned, the Apostle declares that it truly belongs to the Judaizers themselves, inasmuch as they by their conduct place themselves outside the pale of the church and thus become as "unclean" as the canine species. Also:

> . . . there may be some allusion to the dogs, not as unclean, but as, especially in their half-wild state in the East, snarling and savage, driving off as interlopers all who approach what they consider their ground. Nothing could better describe the narrow Judaising spirit.[1]

"Beware of the concision" is another adroit use of words.

> By an ironical play upon words St. Paul declares his refusal to call the circumcision, on which the Judaisers prided themselves, by that time-honoured name; for "we," he says, "are the true circumcision," the true Israel of the new covenant. In Eph 2:2 . . . he has denoted it as the "so-called circumcision in the flesh made by hands." Here he speaks more strongly, and calls it a "concision," a mere outward mutilation, no longer, as it had been, a "seal" of the covenant (Rom 4:11).[2]

---

[1]Alfred Barry, "The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians," Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959), p. 80.

[2]Ibid.

To another church, composed largely of Gentile believers Paul had once written:

> For he is not a real Jew who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external and physical. He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal. Rom 2:28, 29. RSV

This is the same argument Paul employs for the Philippians when he declares: "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." His argument is that Christianity is a matter of the heart, rather than of the flesh, and that therefore the Judaizers are not to be heard. It is the same emphasis as is found in the letter to the Galatians. He proceeds next to show that if anyone had a right to boast of external advantages it was himself. Nevertheless, he has renounced all these and trusts in Christ alone. This argument is intended as rebuttal to the attack of the Judaizers upon his teaching and authority.

> Though I myself have reason for confidence in the flesh also. If any other man thinks he has reason for confidence in the flesh, I have more: circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law a Pharisee, as to zeal a persecutor of the church, as to righteousness under the law blameless. But whatever gain I had, I counted as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them as refuse, in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own, based on law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God that depends on faith; that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead. 3:4-11 RSV

In this eloquent survey of his past status and present hopes, Paul reveals that he stands on higher ground than even his Judaizing opponents if the true ground of confidence was merely that of external advantage as suggested by them.

> . . . they had assailed the Apostle; and he replies that he was a better Jew than any of them, and his present attitude was no jealous depreciation of a privilege which he did not possess. He had been 'born in the purple.' He was an heir of the sacred traditions, and had once been devoted to the Law; but he had found in Christ a nobler righteousness, and recognised that legal rites were in comparison naught but 'refuse.'[1]

This argument is somewhat parallel to the inference he has earlier drawn from Christ's descent from glory to the Cross. He had there pointed out that Christ Himself had chosen to renounce all outward glory and honour and had chosen, rather, to display the inner graces of the spirit. Similarly, Paul has renounced his "rights" as a Pharisee, and by the grace of God he has humbled himself to the position of a suppliant pleading for the righteousness of Christ to which he has no legal claim. The Judaizers gloried in externals, but Paul suggests that such behaviour is far afield from the spirit of true Christianity.

His argument now merges into a denial of the third charge of the Judaizers--that his gospel of salvation by faith led to laxity of conduct. Paul asserts that the contrary is true, and that the Christian, like the Olympian runner, strains every nerve to attain his objective. This goal, according to the Apostle, is conformity to the likeness of Christ.

> Not that I have already obtained this or am already perfect; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own. Brethren, I do not consider that I have made it my own, but one thing I do, forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, I press on toward the goal for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus. Let those of us who are mature be thus minded. 3:12-15 RSV

He is careful to indicate the motivation of his striving. Not in order to gain acceptance with God, but because Christ has already made him his own, is the reason given. Thus the distinction between his

---

[1]David Smith, p. 517.

theology and that of the Judaizers is indicated. They were committed to an anxious course of religious works in order that they might ultimately be acknowledge by God, but Paul's works are the deeds of a son rejoicing in his father's love. To emphasize further that his gospel delivered believers from sinful habits, the Apostle contrasts the attitude of those who were practical antinomians with the behaviour of those who served Christ.

> Brethren, join in imitating me, and mark those who so live as you have an example in us. For many, of whom I have often told you and now tell you even with tears, live as enemies of the cross of Christ. Their end is destruction, their god is the belly, and they glory in their shame, with minds set on earthly things. But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . 3:17-20 RSV

It is noticeable that throughout this letter the Apostle does not engage in formal dialectics. That is, his arguments are never in broadside fashion. They are gently expressed, incidentally almost, in the midst of affectionate discourse. In strong contrast to the Galatian church, this one has not been guilty of any majority dereliction. Therefore, the strong polemical tone found in Galatians is absent in this case. His endeavour is to convince through the counsels of affectionate authority.[1] Logic is not absent, but its skeletal framework is girded about with genial expressions of fraternal discourse. It is doubtful whether more direct argumentation would have been appropriate or profitable in the existing situation.

Before alluding once more to his theme of unity, Paul addresses the Philippians with affectionate entreaty.

> Therefore, my brethren, whom I love and long for, my joy and crown, stand firm thus in the Lord, my beloved.
>
> I entreat Euodia and I entreat Syntyche to agree in the Lord. And I ask you also, true yokefellow, help these women,

---

[1]This aspect is further discussed under Ethos.

> for they have labored side by side with me in the gospel together with Clement and the rest of my fellow workers, whose names are in the book of life. 4:1-3 RSV

This is the final word regarding unity in this message, and it particularly concerns two women of high character who at this time were experiencing a disagreement. Apparently Euodia and Syntyche had been Paul's helpers during critical times at Philippi. The word here translated "labored" literally means "joined with me in my struggle." Now, by dissension they were on the verge of breaking down what they had laboured to build up. All that Paul has already said concerning unity was probably meant for them particularly. With great tact he has not, however, referred to them by name until the last. Paul asks a fellow worker whom he calls "true yokefellow" to help these church ladies to come to unanimity once more. Some have suggested that Luke may have been this "yokefellow," but there is no certain way of ascertaining his identity.

To reinforce his admonitions regarding the spirit of harmony, Paul reminds the church that believers should ever live as on the verge of the return of Christ. Such an anticipation would foster the spirit of forbearance so vital in the avoidance of personal conflicts.

> Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice. Let all men know your forbearance. The Lord is at hand. 4:4,5 RSV

If affronts or difficulties seemed too difficult to meet with an attitude of forbearance, another remedy lay at hand. Paul urges the Philippians to have frequent recourse to prayer.

> Have no anxiety about anything, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known to God. And the peace of God, which passes all understanding, will keep your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus. 4:6,7 RSV

The word translated "keep" means "to guard as with a garrison." In view of Paul's own spirit of rejoicing though a Roman prisoner under Nero, this suggestion has peculiar power. He would have these believers know that however many of life's difficulties might threaten to destroy their peace, the consolations and resources of Christian faith were adequate. Possibly the implication is that even the minor dissensions of the church should be met in this way.

Before extending his gratitude for the gift from Philippi, the Apostle addresses to his auditors a comprehensive admonition calculated to establish in them the graces and virtues of which he has previously spoken. Apparently a believer in "the expulsive power of a new affection" Paul apparently hoped that positive concern with lofty themes would banish all traces of disunity from the ranks of the worshippers at Philippi.

> Finally, brethren, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is gracious, if there is any excellence, if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things. What you have learned and received and heard and seen in me, do; and the God of peace will be with you. 4:8, 9 RSV

The admonition not only suggests trains of thought but intimates that these will lead to action. "Think about these things." "What you have learned . . . do."

Subsidiary Theme

We turn now to the subsidiary theme of the discourse. As previously mentioned, the Philippians had been sorrowful concerning Paul's estate, and also over the condition of Epaphroditus. The use of the words "joy" and "rejoice" almost a score of times indicates that the Apostle's subsidiary theme was "rejoice in all circumstances." Thus closely

linked with the final admonition regarding unity is the apostolic mandate "have no anxiety about anything." 4:6 RSV

Following Paul's greeting at the opening of the letter appears his declaration that his imprisonment has become a cause of rejoicing rather than sorrow.

> I want you to know, brethren, that what has happened to me has really served to advance the gospel, so that it has become known throughout the whole praetorian guard and to all the rest that my imprisonment is for Christ; and most of the brethren have been made confident in the Lord because of my imprisonment, and are much more bold to speak the word of God without fear. Some indeed preach Christ from envy and rivalry, but others from good will. The latter do it out of love, knowing that I am put here for the defense of the gospel; the former proclaim Christ out of partisanship, not sincerely but thinking to afflict me in my imprisonment. What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and in that I rejoice. Yes, and I shall rejoice. For I know that through your prayers and the help of the Spirit of Jesus Christ this will turn out for my deliverance. . . . 1:12-19 RSV

The Philippians had feared that Paul's imprisonment would curtail the work of evangelising the world. "The reverse is the case" says Paul.

> They must not suppose, he tells them, that he is the Apostle of a ruined cause, or that his imprisonment is a sign that God's frown is on his work, and that it is coming to naught; on the contrary, he wants them to recognise that his misfortunes have been overruled by God to the direct furtherance of the Gospel. The necessity of his being coupled to guardsman after guardsman, day after day and night after night, had resulted in the notoriety of his condition as a prisoner for Christ among all the Praetorian cohorts, and to everybody else; and the majority of the brethren had been stimulated by his bonds to a divine confidence, which had shown itself in a yet more courageous daring than before in preaching the word of God.[1]

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 597.

Those referred to as preaching Christ "from envy and rivalry" were probably Judaizers who took the opportunity of Paul's being out of the way to advance their peculiar brand of Christianity. Despite this, I rejoice, affirms the Apostle. Had he not written to another church years before that "all things work together for good for them that love Christ"? Rom 8:28

The implication of these verses is that if Paul found occasion for rejoicing in his condition, the Philippians in their freedom should be even more joyous. Furthermore, they need not sorrow regarding the work of the gospel, for it was being advanced by the very measures that had threatened to curtail it.

The thought is extended in the next chapter.

> Even if I am to be poured as a libation upon the sacrificial offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all. Likewise you also should be glad and rejoice with me.
> 2:17, 18 RSV

As libations of wine were often poured upon sacrificial offerings, so his blood might be shed as the libation over the sacrificial and faithful behaviour of the Philippians, says the Apostle. But in that case, even in the event of martyrdom, he declares he will be glad and rejoice. The metaphor is somewhat striking in that it not only indicates his approaching execution but also the manner of it. Had he been burned or crucified as many of the early Christians were, this figure would not have been as appropriate. But when one considers the effusion of blood that is associated with decapitation, it is evident how fitting is this particular metaphor. He does not say why the possibility of such an event should be a cause for rejoicing. Either he longed for the rest which he believed would usher him into the presence of Christ, or he assumed that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church."
A related passage is found in the first chapter.

> . . . it is my eager expectation and hope that I shall not be at all ashamed, but that with full courage now as always Christ will be honored in my body, whether by life or by death. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.
> 1:20, 21 RSV

It would seem that Paul was making sure that not even his death, should it transpire, would be a cause of lasting sorrow to the Philippians. Even death is gain to the Christian, he asserts, and therefore rejoice, rejoice in ALL things. His thought is similar to one expressed earlier in the Thessalonians. "Rejoice always . . . give thanks in all circumstances; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus for you." 1 Thess 5:16, 18 RSV It is quite evidently Paul's philosophy that God is the one great Circumstance and that all events are either initiated or permitted by His will for the benefit of believers. In this letter he endeavours to pass on to the church at Philippi the same conviction. Thus in these first two chapters he has pointed out that his imprisonment, the partisan preaching of envious Judaizers, and even the threat of execution, caused him to rejoice. Bengel has declared that four words sum up this letter. They are "I rejoice, rejoice ye."[1] These very words are found in Paul's comment regarding his possible martyrdom in 2:17, 18.

This same note recurs in the next two chapters.

> Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. 3:1 RSV

> . . . our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself.
> Therefore, my brethren, whom I love and long for, my joy and crown, stand firm thus in the Lord, my beloved.
> 3:20--4:1 RSV

> Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice. . . . Have no anxiety about anything, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made

---

[1]Bengel, cited by Angus, p. 720.

known to God. And the peace of God, which passes all understanding, will keep your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus. 4:4, 6, 7

In these passages, the Apostle mentions several reasons for the spirit of rejoicing. He refers to the heavenly citizenship which belonged to the believers, and announces the surety of the return of Christ. In that great day, he declares, these weak and often pain-racked bodies of ours will be changed into bodies that are incorruptible. Here and now it is the privilege of every Christian to commit every anxiety to the Lord in prayer, and to experience the guardianship of the divine peace. Because of these things, says Paul, rejoice in the Lord.

It is noticeable that he does not suggest that the things of this world are to be rejoiced over in their own right. Twice in these chapters he attaches to the verb "rejoice" the phrase "in the Lord." It is upon the Giver, rather than His gifts, that he apparently endeavors to focus the attention of his auditors.

There is little by way of closely reasoned argument in these passages because, judging from the tone of the entire epistle, the Philippians required reminding of old truths rather than persuasion concerning new ones. Nevertheless, the strength and range of the Apostle's ideas remain impressive for many, even today. In this letter the philosophical concepts are both transcendent and pragmatic, a rare combination in philosophy. They are transcendent because they soar beyond what can be immediately verified by the senses, they appeal to supernatural realities which cannot be measured or confined. The idea of rejoicing in ALL circumstances, even in the face of death, is typical of these concepts. Yet, as applied to the Apostle, these same concepts become pragmatic in application. They have a most practical bearing upon every-day issues. The Apostle soars high in describing

the glory and subsequent humiliation of Christ, but he does so in order that church officers and laity might learn to dwell in loving unity. He urges persecuted and harried Christians to "rejoice in the Lord" in order that their daily Christian witness might not be impaired by the spirit of depression.

This linking of the theoretical and the practical characterizes every discourse of Paul's. He lived in both hemispheres of existence, and this is not the least aspect of his greatness. In the final use of the word "rejoice" in this epistle we have another example of this characteristic of the Apostle.

> I rejoice in the Lord greatly that now at length you have revived your concern for me; you were indeed concerned for me, but you had no opportunity. Not that I complain of want; for I have learned, in whatever state I am, to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know how to abound; in any and all circumstances I have learned the secret of facing plenty and hunger, abundance and want. I can do all things in him who strengthens me.
>
> Yet it was kind of you to share my trouble. And you Philippians yourselves know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I left Macedonia, no church entered into partnership with me in giving and receiving except you only; for even in Thessalonica you sent me help once and again. Not that I seek the gift; but I seek the fruit which increases to your credit. I have received full payment, and more; I am filled, having received from Epaphroditus the gifts you sent, a fragrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God. And my God will supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus. To our God and Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen. 4:10-20 RSV

Here the Apostle travels in brief compass from a "thank you" for a gift, to a doxology. On the way he intermingles memories of the past with philosophical counsels for present living.

Analysis of Pathos

The circumstances surrounding the dictation of this address suggest the probable nature of the pathetic proof inherent in the message. To the recipients Paul seemed to be but a step away from martyrdom. Chained to a Roman soldier by day and night, the Apostle was waiting for the order to appear before Nero. Some scholars believe that at the time of the writing of this epistle, Paul had been shifted from his hired house to less comfortable quarters.

> There is evidently an increase in the rigour of his imprisonment implied now, as compared with the early stage of it, as described in Acts 28; cf 1:29, 30; 2:27. History furnishes a probable clue to account for this increase of vigour. In the second year of St. Paul's imprisonment (A.D. 62), Burrus, the Praetorian Prefect, to whose custody he had been permitted (Acts 28:16, "the captain of the guard"), died; and Nero the emperor having divorced Octavia, and married Poppoea, a Jewish proselytess (who then caused her rival, Octavia, to be murdered, and gloated over the head of her victim), exalted Tigellinus, the chief promoter of the marriage, a monster of wickedness, to the Praetorian Prefecture. It was then he seems to have been removed from his own house into the Praetorium, or barracks of the Praetorian guards, attached to the palace, for stricter custody; and hence he writes with less hopeful anticipations as to the result of this trial (ch 2:17; 3:11).[1]

This situation aroused the tender sympathies of the Philippians as evidenced by their sending of the gift of money, and the messenger Epaphroditus. Anxiously, they would wait for return word from the imprisoned Apostle. He had been the founder of their church, and had witnessed the baptism of many of them. Thus they counted him as their spiritual father. On Paul's part also there was strong affection[2] for the

---

[1]Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, Commentary on the Whole Bible, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), pp. 359-360.

[2]It is recognized that the evidences here cited of Paul's goodwill towards the Philippians constitute ethical proof. The discussion in this section suggests that the same evidences are pathetic because they were likely to stimulate a response of love and sympathy and thus obedience.

members of the first church in Europe. He dictates his message with the awareness that he may never see them again. More than once this church has remembered his needs when all others seemed to forget. Thus:

> The entire contents breathe an inmost and touching love for this favorite church. No other letter is so rich in heartfelt expressions and tender allusions--none so characteristically epistolatory, without exact arrangement, without doctrinal discussions, without Old Testament citations and dialectic argumentations. None is so completely a letter of the heart, an outburst of passionate longing for the fellowship of love amid outward desertion and affliction; so that although at times almost elegiac in its tone, it is a model of the union of tender love with apostolic dignity and boldness.[1]

The main pathetic emphasis in this discourse is upon the affections and sentiments. Paul expresses his own affection with such apparent sincerity that this revelation was likely to intensify the bonds of sympathy already existing between him and his auditors. Certainly the major purpose behind the address is to persuade the Philippians to do all in their power to resist the threats of disunity, but this purpose never stands out starkly. Each passage referring to the desirable nature of church harmony is clothed about with phrases and clauses expressive of fraternal love. Probably this method was the most apposite to the audience situation, and therefore calculated better to persuade than any extended show of formal reasoning. Typical of Paul's manner in this letter is the introduction which follows the greeting.

> I thank my God in all my remembrance of you, always in every prayer of mine for you all making my prayer with joy, thankful for your partnership in the gospel from the first day until now. And I am sure that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ. It is right for me to feel thus about you all, because I hold you in my heart, for you are all partakers with me of grace, both in my imprisonment and in the defense and confirmation of the gospel. For God is my witness, how I yearn for you all with the affection of Christ Jesus.
>
> 1:3-8 RSV

---

[1]Meyer, quoted in Lange's Commentary, Vol. 22, p. 4.

Paul says that every memory he has concerning these Christians is one that gives him cause to thank God. They have been partners with him in the work of the gospel from the very first. That is, they have helped him by their persons, their money, and their prayers. Because of this close partnership, Paul ever carries them in his heart, and "yearns" that their upright conduct may be maintained to the last. In the last line he suggests that it is the love of Christ who dwells within him that reaches out to the Philippians. Now he proceeds to declare the nature of his prayers on their behalf.

> And it is my prayer that your love may abound more and more, with knowledge and all discernment, so that you may approve what is excellent, and may be pure and blameless for the day of Christ, filled with the fruits of righteousness which come through Jesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God. 1:9-11 RSV

> If we study carefully the opening thanksgivings and prayers of St. Paul's Epistles, we may note that he always thanks God for what is strong in the Church to which he writes, and prays God for the supply of that in which it is weak. Here he thanks God for the characteristic enthusiasm and large-heartedness of the Philippians; he prays for their advance in knowledge, perception, judgment--the more intellectual and thoughtful side of the Christian character--in which they, and perhaps the Macedonian Churches generally, were less conspicuous. In the opposite case of the Corinthian Church (see 1 Cor 1:4-10), he thanks God for their richness in all utterance and all knowledge, but he bids them "wait" for Him who shall "establish them as blameless," and exhorts them to unity and humility.[1]

The discerning remark of this commentator gives us another clue for Paul's preponderance of pathetic proof in this discourse, and for the lack of that close argumentation which was present in his letter to the Galatians. These Macedonian believers were simple-hearted people comparatively unskilled in polemics, and Paul's approach to them evidences his skill at audience adaptation. The one element that is

---

[1]Barry, Ellicott, Vol. 8, p. 67.

never lacking from his presentation is the evidence of love which even the unschooled can understand. In the reference to the return of the Philippian messenger we have another example of the close sympathy of the Apostle's.

> I have thought it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus my brother and fellow worker and fellow soldier, and your messenger and minister to my need, for he has been longing for you all, and has been distressed because you heard that he was ill. Indeed he was ill, near to death. But God had mercy on him, and not only on him but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow. I am the more eager to send him, therefore, that you may rejoice at seeing him again, and that I may be less anxious. So receive him in the Lord with all joy; and honor such men, for he nearly died for the work of Christ, risking his life to complete your service to me. 2:25-30 RSV

The incidental words "on me also" in the statement "God had mercy on him, and not only on him but on me also" are indicative of the strong personal affection which was implicit in Paul. The sorrows of his imprisonment, at first lightened by the arrival of Epaphroditus, had later been intensified by the dangerous illness of the messenger. For anything to have happened to Epaphroditus would have been to the Apostle as "sorrow upon sorrow" v 27. For the sake of the Philippians and Epaphroditus himself, Paul has urged the latter to return that he might be built up in health.

Concerning the clause "that I may be less anxious" one writer has suggested:

> There is a peculiar pathos in this expression, as contrasted with the completeness of joy described above in verses 7, 18. Epaphroditus' recovery and safe return would take away the "sorrow upon sorrow," but the old sorrow of captivity, enforced inactivity, and anxiety for the condition of the gospel, would remain. The expression of perfect joy belongs to the "spirit which was willing" indeed; the hint of an unspoken sorrow marks the weakness of the flesh.[1]

---

[1]Barry, Ellicott, Vol. 8, p. 79.

The expression "risking his life" is a graphic one in the original Greek. Literally it is "having staked his life" or "having gambled with his life." Possibly it infers that Epaphroditus had engaged in strenuous exertions on behalf of the prisoner awaiting trial, to the premeditated risk of his own life.

As he approaches his conclusion, the Apostle utters once more a spontaneous burst of affection.

> Therefore, my brethren, whom I love and long for, my joy and crown, stand firm thus in the Lord, my beloved. 4:1 RSV

Here are five intimations of his love in a single sentence. It is significant that these expressions are linked to the chief theme of the letter, that these believers should "stand firm in the Lord." Because they were the beloved brethren of Paul, they were to strive not to disappoint his hopes for them. Thus the motives aroused by Paul also constitute logical advocacy. We would stress again what has been previously mentioned, that with Paul the manifestations of logic, pathos, and ethos are indissolubly welded into a single persuasive onslaught. It is most unlikely that Paul ever consciously formed any substantial part of his messages as an appeal to just one aspect of the human personality. He aimed at the whole man.[1]

Similar to the preceding appeals to love, friendship, and respect, is the recurring invitation to noble emulation found in this discourse.

---

[1]Many speech teachers today stress the interrelationship of the various aspects of invention.

"A separate treatment of reasoning and motivation need not mean that these categories are mutually exclusive. The old reason-emotion dichotomy is psychologically unsound. In other words, thoughtful and emotional reactions are interrelated and occur in varying proportions in different situations. If one supports the assertion that firearms must be handled in a certain way by showing how persons may be injured or killed, he is using an appeal which is at once logical and psychological. It is clear that all behavior has its motives; therefore, an advocate who stimulates certain desires and associates them with his proposition is not necessarily using illogical thinking." Glen E. Mills, Composing the Speech (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), p. 193.

Thus Paul in one place says: "Brethren, join in imitating me, and mark those who so live as you have an example in us." 3:17 RSV It is probably not the result of chance that in this letter where he urges the Philippians to "rejoice whatever happens" he reveals that he is doing this very thing. He declares, for example, that even his imprisonment is working out for good, and asserts his belief that even if martyrdom is to be his fate, that also will be made to minister to the profit of the Church. Over and over again he refers to "his joy" amid conditions which would discourage most men. He is rejoicing and would have them learn to do likewise.

The strongest appeal to emulation is found in the second chapter.

> So if there is any encouragement in Christ, any incentive of love, any participation in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy, complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind. Do nothing from selfishness or conceit, but in humility count others better than yourselves. Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others. Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross. Therefore God hath highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.
>
> Therefore, my beloved . . . work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. 2:1-12 RSV (emphasis ours)

In this passage there are appeals to emulation, religious tenets, gratitude, friendship, social values, self-preservations, and altruism.

Emulation. Copy the example of the Christ who humbled Himself to become man, to serve humanity, and to die on a cross, suggests Paul.

Religious tenets. Belief in the Christian doctrines of the incarnation, and the atonement, is made a lever for Paul's task of persuasion.

Gratitude. The first few lines of this passage call for a response of gratitude in view of the many benefits believers are receiving through Christ.

Friendship. Paul appeals to the desire for friendship by suggesting that true behavior will result in group behavior characterized by unity, harmony and love, which can not but confer the benefits of friendship upon every member of the group. When he calls them his "beloved," the Apostle appeals to the friendship that exists between them and himself as a motivating factor for good conduct.

Social values. The social values of unity and concord, of unselfish service, are described in this passage; and the prospect of eternal reward is alluded to in order to show the worthwhileness of adhering to such values.

Self-preservation. The Philippians are reminded that Christ, who gave up His life, had it restored to Him once more. He was exalted and given a name "above every name." It is implied that a similar reward will be given to those who follow Christ's example.

Altruism. The emphasis on self-forgetful service and humility appeals to whatever is altruistic in man's nature.

Foremost among these appeals is the one to emulation. Paul had already asserted that for him "to live was Christ" 2:21. He anticipates that with the Philippians also "Christ would be honoured always" 1:20. Because He was the focal point of their hope and faith, there could be no stronger appeal than to copy the great Exemplar.

> . . . in striving to urge on the Philippians the example of humility and unselfishness as the only possible bases of unity, he sets before them the Divine lowliness which had descended step by step into the very abyss of degradation. He tells them of Christ's eternal possession of the attributes of God; His

> self-abnegation of any claim to that equality; His voluntary exinanition of His glory; His assumption of the essential attributes of a slave; His becoming a man in all external semblance; His display of obedience to His Father, even to death, and not only death, but--which might well thrill the heart of those who possessed the right of Roman citizenship, and were therefore exempt from the possibility of so frightful a degradation--death by crucifixion. Such were the elements of Christ's self-abasement! Yet that self-humiliation had purchased its own infinite reward. . . . Could they have a stronger incentive?[1]

In answer to the closing question of this quotation, we would say that it is unlikely that Paul could have provided a stronger incentive to right conduct than in this synopsis of Christ's condescension in man's behalf.

In the same chapter Paul offers other examples of sacrificial service. In this instance they are in the form of mortals like the Philippians themselves, and ones known personally to them. The Apostle refers to his own example, and that of Timothy, as well as the unselfish conduct of Epaphroditus, the Macedonian's own messenger.

> Do all things without grumbling or questioning, that you may be blameless and innocent. . . . so that in the day of Christ I may be proud that I did not run in vain or labor in vain. Even if I am to be poured as a libation upon the sacrificial offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all, Likewise you also should be glad and rejoice with me.
>
> I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy to you soon. . . . Timothy's worth you know, how as a son with a father he has served with me in the gospel . . . I have thought it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus my brother and fellow worker and fellow soldier, and your messenger and minister to my need, . . . So receive him in the Lord with all joy; and honor such men, for he nearly died for the work of Christ, risking his life to complete your service to me. 2:14-30 RSV

By glancing at the chapter, it can be easily seen that Paul's plea to the Philippians to live in harmony, exhibiting "blameless and innocent"

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 600.

lives, is wedged in between the citation of the condescension of Christ, and the examples of the founders of the local church, and of Epaphroditus its messenger. The pathetic appeal seems well adapted to the particular audience which he addresses.

There is yet another aspect to Paul's use of pathos in this epistle. Not only does he incite to good conduct by expression of his love for them and by reference to the examples of Christ, his own life, Timothy, and Epaphroditus, but he also seeks to appeal to the sentiments of joy and hope. In the section on Logos we have considered the reasoning employed by the Apostle in the endeavour to show that it is a Christian's privilege to rejoice in all circumstances. He had pointed out that even the most apparently discouraging situations such as his imprisonment could work out so well as to cause rejoicing (1:12-20). Furthermore, he had reminded them of their privileges in Christ, such as the privilege of prayer, intended as a means of banishing all that would threaten the spirit of joyfulness (4:4-7). These arguments and examples are also closely linked with the sentiment of hope. For example, in 1:19-20, Paul links rejoicing with hope.

> Yes, and I shall rejoice. For I know that through your prayers and the help of the Spirit of Jesus Christ this will turn out for my deliverance, as it is my eager expectation and hope that I shall not be at all ashamed, but that with full courage now as always Christ will be honored in my body, whether by life or by death. RSV

These words indicate that Paul's own rejoicing is a result of the hope he has in Christ that all will work out well, even the temporary sleep of death.

Towards the close of the discourse the Apostle endeavours to strengthen hope in his auditors by pointing them to their heavenly inheritance, and the resurrection body to be theirs at the return of Christ.

> But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself. . . . Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say Rejoice. Let all men know your forbearance. The Lord is at hand. 3:20-4:5 RSV

In summary we could say that the pathetic appeal of this discourse is made chiefly to the affections and sentiments, with particular emphasis upon emulation and religious feelings such as joy and hope. While it is extremely doubtful that pathos of this nature would succeed with any audience composed of present crosscurrents of society, it seems likely that such overtones and appeals were most appropriate for an audience like that of the Philippian Christians in A.D. 62.

Analysis of Ethos

A study of this discourse suggests that it is the underlying stratum of ethical appeal which gives weight and power to the whole. There is little formal argument, and much of the pathetic appeal is made through the revelation of Paul's own good-will in such a way as probably to stir up a similar response in his hearers. Aristotle, long before Paul, affirmed that "we might almost affirm that the speaker's character is the most potent of all the means to persuasion." Paul's previous reputation constitutes a large part of the ethical appeal in Philippians.

> In its original sense, ethos meant the impressions of character, intelligence, and good will which the listeners received during the speaker's performance. According to this view, an orator was defined as "a good man skilled in speaking." Nowadays the concept includes not only what the speaker does in the presence of the audience but also what the listeners have heard about him before the occasion. In other words, the speaker's reputation and position in society influence the listener's judgments.[1]

---

[1]Mills, p. 313.

The "intelligence" of the Apostle is suggested in this discourse by the manner in which he chose to accomplish his purpose of persuasion. Adapting his materials to his audience, Paul skillfully chose to motivate by well-chosen examples and by religious appeals rather than by close and extended argument. The prolonged reasoning so common in the letter to the Corinthians who prided themselves on their intellectuality is absent in this message to a less sophisticated people.

We have already observed the many evidences of Paul's love for his listeners. In chapter one he declared that every remembrance of them caused him to praise God, that he held them "in his heart." In chapter two they are called his "beloved," and the Apostle asserts that he thinks so much of them that if his martyrdom ensued he would consider it but an appropriate libation over the sacrifical offering of their faithful conduct. The following chapter reveals his affection by his fatherly warnings concerning problems in their pathway. Typical of the fourth and last chapter is the first verse: "Therefore, my brethren, whom I love and long for, my joy and crown, stand firm thus in the Lord, my beloved." From first to last, the letter breathes the atmosphere of affection.

The most outstanding feature of the ethical appeal of Philippians is its revelation of the lofty character of Paul. That a man on the verge of death could be so selfless as to pour out his soul on behalf of others is an impressive revelation. An extended quotation from one of the greatest of Pauline scholars indicates the forcefulness of this phase of ethical appeal in the present letter. Farrar contrasts Paul with some other ancient worthies in similar positions.

> When Paul and Silas lay in the deepest dungeons of Philippi, scored and bleeding from the flagellation which the local "Praetors" had inflicted upon them in the forum, they had sung songs in the night. Another song now emanates from the Apostle's Roman prison. His letter is like one of those

magnificent pieces of music which, amid all its stormy fugues and mighty discords, is dominated by some inner note of triumph which at last bursts forth into irresistible and glorious victory. It is new and marvellous. What was there thus to fill the soul and flood the utterance of St. Paul with joy? The letter was dictated by a worn and fettered Jew, the victim of gross perjury, and the prey of contending enmities; dictated by a man of feeble frame, in afflicted circumstances, vexed with hundreds of opponents, and with scarce one friend to give him consolation. Could any one have been embittered with deeper wrongs, or tormented by deadlier sufferings? Before we look upon this serene cheerfulness, this unmurmuring resignation of St. Paul as a matter of course, compare him for a moment with others whose circumstances were a thousandfold less pitiable than his. . . . Cicero was, for a short time, exiled. His exile had every mitigation. He was not imprisoned. He could choose his own home. He was surrounded wherever he went with wealth, luxury, admiration, troops of friends. He knew that the great and the powerful were using all their influence on his behalf. And yet, though he claimed to be a philosopher, though he had published whole volumes of lofty exhortation, there is scarcely one of the many letters which he wrote during that short exile which is not full of unmanly lamentations.

Take another instance. Seneca was a contemporary of St Paul; he may even have seen him. He was a man of immense wealth, of high rank, of great reputation; a man who wrote books full of the most sounding professions of Stoic endurance and Stoic superiority to passion and to pain. He too was, for a short time, exiled to Sardinia. He too was free, and rich, and he had powerful friends. How did he bear his exile? He too broke into abject complaints, and in spite of his Stoicism was not ashamed to grovel with extravagant flatteries at the feet of a worthless freedman, to induce him to procure his return. . . .

We might take other instances. We might compare St. Paul in exile with Clarendon, or Atterbury, or Bolingbroke. His lot was incomparably worse than theirs, for he was not only an exile, he was cold and hungry, and a prisoner and lonely, and suffering and distressed by the constant machinations of bitter opponents, and with the sword of the headsman hanging, as it were, by a thread over his neck. Yet his magnanimity stands out in bright contrast with even the best and greatest of these. He does not, like Cicero, weary his friends with complaints and importunities. He does not, like Dante, yield to a brooding melancholy. No such

> gloom comes over him as that which fell on our own great exiles. Yet he was more guiltless than any of these, and his sufferings were infinitely more unmerited. Amid poverty and imprisonment, with the frown of the tyrant bent on him, death seeming to stare him in the face, the fundamental note in the many-toned music of his letter is the note of joy.[1]

Even in the smallest of matters the ethical appeal of the Apostle is evident. For example in the first verse we read: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus. . . ." This is the only occasion where Paul does not attach to the introductory use of his name some title of apostolic authority. His attitude is that of confident familiarity and he calls himself and Timotheus "servants." It is as though he were saying "There is no need for me assert my apostleship to you." Possibly also he does this "in order to be able to join himself and his young fellow-worker under a common title."[2] The courtesy of Paul in linking with his own name in the address that of Timothy, who had helped him in the founding of the Philippian church, is apparent. The delicacy of this salutation is typical of the tone throughout the epistle.

As we consider the character of Paul as revealed in this discourse we are reminded of the oft repeated advice of rhetorical theorists that cultivation of the moral qualities is a primary duty of the public speaker.

> The letter is more distinctively personal than any of the epistles to the churches except 2 Corinthians. In this lies largely its peculiar fascination. But the personality is accentuated on a different side. Its sensitive, indignant, self-vindicatory aspect, so marked in the Corinthian letter, is completely in the background here. The Paul of the Philippian letter is not the man whose apostolic credentials have been challenged, and whose personal motives have been impugned; not the vindicator of himself and of his ministry against the pretensions of false apostles; not the

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, pp. 303-305.

[2]Godet, p. 498.

> missionary who is reluctantly constrained in his own defense to unfold the record of his labors and sufferings. He is the disciple who counts all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord; for whom to live is Christ, and to die is to be with Christ. . . . With an experience behind him unique in its depth and richness and variety, with the memory of personal vision of Christ and of ravishment into the third heaven, with a profound knowledge of the mysteries of divine truth won through heart-shaking moral crises, in solitary meditation and in the vast experience of his missionary career,--his attainment is only a point for a larger outlook, an impulse to more vigorous striving. In Christ he is in a sphere of infinite possibilities, and he counts not himself to have apprehended, but stretches forward under the perpetual stress of his heavenward calling.[1]

Such passages as the following in Philippians are indicative of the letter's revelation of the character of Paul, and each terse statement suggests a world of meaning.

> For me to live is Christ. . . . 1:21 RSV

> Even if I am to be poured as a libation upon the sacrifical offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all. 2:17 RSV

> . . . whatever gain I had, I counted as loss for the sake of Christ. Indeed I count everything as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them as refuse, in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own, based on law, but that which is through faith in Christ. . . that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings. . . . 3:7-10 RSV

> Not that I have already obtained this or am already perfect; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own. Brethren, I do not consider that I have made it my own; but one thing I do, forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, I press on toward the goal for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus. 3:12-14 RSV

These remarks could not but remind the Philippians of the Paul of ten years before who had sung in the city's dungeon and saved its

---

[1]Marvin R. Vincent, Philippians and Philemon, of The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh, 1950), p. xxxvi.

jailor from suicide. To have resisted the appeal of such a man would have been hardly possible for those who already had been persuaded by him to revolutionise their way of life. Paul's inducements to unity and godly living are but the materials constituting a gem-box wherein resides the jewel of his own character. Many would declare the extravagance warranted if we declared that such a revelation of ethos is almost without parallel.

Analysis of Arrangement

This discourse follows to some degree the typical format of a Pauline epistolatory address. It contains the usual greeting, thanksgiving, benediction, and farewell. The body of the letter, however, consists of practical exhortations interspersed with doctrinal allusions, which procedure stands in contrast to Paul's usual presentation of a separate and prior doctrinal section.

What is the cause for this deviation from the Apostle's customary practice? The most likely explanation lies in the nature of the letter. It is a friendly, informal epistle. Earlier it was observed that in the greeting Paul omits reference to his apostolic standing, unlike all his previous introductions to the churches. He does not stand on ceremony with the Philippians, and neither does he represent himself as one seeking to influence by the weight of authority alone. In this instance we have the expression of a loving, grateful friend whose counsels are intermingled with personal and affectionate asides.

Because of the friendly informality of this letter we do not have before us a closely knit pattern of doctrine or argument wherein every section articulates with the preceding and the following. Nevertheless, as pointed out in the discussion regarding the development of ideas, the epistle does possess a central theme--that of unity, and also a

subsidiary theme concerning the Christian duty of rejoicing in all circumstances. We recall in this connection that

> . . . the critic is interested in finding out whether the speaker's conception of his task--be it to explain, to entertain, to convince, or to persuade--is clear, and whether the selection and arrangement of the ideas conduce to their effectiveness.[1]

Certainly it seems apparent that the Apostle had a clear conception of his task, and the arguments marshalled by him were so selected and arranged on the whole (considering the purposeful informality of the letter) as to be conducive to the effectiveness of his designs.

We do not find evidence in the introduction that the Apostle made a calculated attempt to gain the attention and interest of his audience. Neither does his conclusion fulfill some of the classic purposes of an effective conclusion. On the other hand, momentary reflection is sufficient to suggest why this is the case. Paul had no hostile audience to woo. In all probability, before the first word of his message was read aloud, the audience was attentive and expectant, inasmuch as they dearly loved this human author of their religious experience. In this instance there was no strong element of opposition to Paul such as existed in the Corinthian and Galatian situations. The words of Eisenson are pertinent in this connection.

> A successful performance requires that the speaker have ability in arousing and directing only those responses which are useful for his purpose. The technique of influencing an audience is divided by Hollingworth into five steps: (1) Securing attention, (2) Establishing interest, (3) Making an impression, (4) Convincing the audience, and (5) Directing the audience.
>
> Not in every audience, however, does the speaker have to go through all five steps. Frequently part of the job may be done for him before he meets the audience. The amount of the task that remains to be done and the amount already accomplished

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 393.

depend in large part upon the type of audience and the audience situation with which the speaker is concerned.

. . . . . .

The fourth general type of audience is the rather highly integrated, concerted audience. The members of this type of audience assemble because they have a concerted active purpose, and a mutual and sympathetic interest in an enterprise. . . . The speaker in such a group has to convince and to direct action. He has the right to expect, unless he is a particularly poor speaker, that attention, interest, and the making of an impression are inherent in the speech situation.[1] (emphasis ours)

Results

We have no precise knowledge of the immediate results of this discourse to the Philippians. We do know, however, that about a generation later, when Polycarp wrote to the same church, his letter, like that of Paul, was full of commendation.[2] Thus it would appear probable that the problem of incipient disunity at Philippi had dissolved, either as a result of the Apostle's letter or some other potent but unknown cause.

In the closing pages of this dissertation will be found in addition to a rhetorical evaluation some remarks regarding the long-range influence of Paul's letters, including the present one to the Philippians. For the present it may suffice to point out that the passage concerning Christ's kenosis (2:5-11) has been probably the most influential and the most frequently quoted passage of all Scripture in theological controversy. It has particularly dominated the unending disputes regarding the nature of Christ. At the famous church councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, which molded dogma for generations to come, it was this passage in Philippians which played the major part in the conclusions

---

[1]Jon Eisenson. The Psychology of Speech (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938), pp. 204-206.

[2]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 605.

reached. Furthermore, the influence of the Pauline statements regarding the Christian duties of spiritual unity and rejoicing, while admittedly beyond exact calculations, has certainly permeated a large portion of Christian society for centuries.

VII. THE DISCOURSE TO PHILEMON AND THE CHURCH AT HIS HOUSE

> . . . whereas the letters of the great Romans [Cicero, Seneca, Pliny] with all their literary skill and finish, often leave on us an involuntary impression of the vanity, the insincerity, even in some instances the entire moral instability of their writers, on the other hand, this brief letter of St. Paul reveals to us yet another glimpse of a character worthy of the very noblest utterances which we find in his other Epistles. These few lines, at once so warmhearted and so dignified, . . . express principles of eternal applicability which even down to the latest times have had no small influence in the development of the world's history.[1]

> As though Heaven cared for slaves![2]

> It is forbidden to teach a slave the Law.[3]

> And thus the Epistle to Philemon becomes the practical manifesto of Christianity against the horrors and iniquities of ancient and modern slavery. From the very nature of the Christian Church--from the fact that it was "a kingdom not of this world"--it could not be revolutionary. It was never meant to prevail by physical violence, or to be promulgated by the sword. It was the revelation of eternal principles, not the elaboration of practical details.[4]

> It is the letter of a Christian gentleman, kindly, courteous, tactful, unselfish, and chivalrous, not too proud to solicit a favour yet incapable of servility, and withal possessing that quality of

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 623.

[2]Macrob. Saturn. 11.

[3]Ketubhoth 28, 1.

[4]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 625.

humour which is the salt of social intercourse. It is the sort of appeal which is irresistible.[1]

He speaks, therefore, with that peculiar grace of humility and courtesy, which has, under the reign of Christianity, developed the spirit of chivalry, and what is called "the character of a gentleman"--certainly very little known in the old Greek and Roman civilisations--while yet in its graceful flexibility and vivacity it stands contrasted with the more impassive Oriental stateliness.[2]

The letter . . . has been drawn up with the same attention, the same care, the same solicitude of heart and logic as an Epistle to the Corinthians or the Romans. This is the characteristic feature of true charity. The very smallness of its object proves its reality and forms its grandeur.[3]

. . . a Semite by the austere gravity of his piety, the apostle was a Hellene by the amenity of his spirit and the grace of his language. Erasmus praised his Ciceronian eloquence with reference to the passage at the end of Romans viii.; cannot one also praise the Atticism of his Epistle to Philemon. . . .[4]

Phillips Translation of Philemon

Paul, prisoner for the sake of Jesus Christ, and brother Timothy to Philemon our fellow-worker, Apphia our sister and Archippus who is with us in the fight; to the Church that meets in your house--grace and peace be to you from God our Father and from the Lord, Jesus Christ.

I always thank God for you, Philemon, in my constant prayers for you all, for I have heard how you love and trust both the Lord Jesus Himself and those who believe in Him. And I pray that those who share your faith may also share your knowledge of

---

[1]David Smith, p. 574.

[2]Barry, Ellicott, Vol. 8, p. 268.

[3]Godet, p. 460.

[4]Ibid.

all the good things that believing in Jesus Christ can mean to us. It is your love that gives us such comfort and happiness, for it cheers the hearts of your fellow-Christians. And although I could rely on my authority in Christ and dare to order you to do what I consider right, I am not doing that. No, I am appealing to that love of yours, a simple personal appeal from Paul the old man, in prison for Jesus Christ's sake. I am appealing for my child. Yes, I have become a father though I have been under lock and key, and the child's name is --Onesimus! Oh, I know you have found him pretty useless in the past but he is going to be useful now, to both of us. I am sending him back to you: will you receive him as my son, part of me? I should have dearly loved to have kept him with me: he could have done what you would have done--looked after me here in prison for the Gospel's sake. But I would do nothing without consulting you first, for if you have a favour to give me, let it be spontaneous and not forced from you by circumstances!

It occurs to me that there has been a purpose in your losing him. You lost him, a slave, for a time; now you are having him back for good, not merely a slave, but as a brother-Christian. He is already especially loved by me--how much more will you be able to love him, both as a man and as a fellow-Christian! You and I have so much in common, haven't we? Then do welcome him as you would welcome me. If you feel he has wronged or cheated you put it down to my account. I've written this with my own hand: I, Paul, hereby promise to repay you. (Of course I'm not stressing the fact that you might be said to owe me your very soul!) Now do grant me this favour, my brother--such an act of love will do my old heart good. As I send you this letter I know you'll do what I ask--I believe, in fact, you'll do more.

Will you do something else? Get the guest-room ready for me, for I have great hopes that through your prayers I myself will be returned to you as well!

Epaphras, here in prison with me, sends his greetings: so do Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke, all fellow-workers for God. The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, Amen.

PAUL. (emphasis in text)

The Occasion

The immediate setting of the letter to Philemon can be easily reconstructed from the epistle itself, and from a few verses in Colossians. The letter was written by Paul from Rome during his first imprisonment about the year 63 A.D. It was occasioned by the conversion of a runaway slave from Colossae who had journeyed to Rome in the hope of "covering his tracks" and losing his identity in the great city. How the slave came in contact with the prisoner we do not know. We are aware that many of the Roman Christians were slaves, and possibly it was through the instrumentality of one of these that Onesimus was introduced to Paul. Another likelihood lies in the possibility of Paul's already being known to the slave. The epistle clearly informs us that Paul and the master of Onesimus were intimately acquainted, and therefore it may have been that the slave had seen or at least heard of the Apostle.

For about two years of his first Roman imprisonment, Paul was permitted to live in a house rented at his own expense. While chained to his Roman guard, he taught regularly all who visited him. (See Acts 28:16-30). There are indications that later the Apostle was shifted to the barracks of the Praetorian guards for stricter custody. Probably it was during the first period of his imprisonment that Paul had occasion to write to Philemon. The converted Onesimus had confessed the robbery of his master, but was willing now to return and face the household at Colossae.

To understand the real nature of the problem facing Paul, it is necessary to glance at the institution of slavery in the Roman world. Estimates of the number of slaves during the first century A.D. vary considerably, but it is probable that there were at least forty million in number.

> Outwardly, the Roman state during the first century of our era was a magnificent political structure, so large that Alexander's empire became one of its minor provinces. Underneath this glory there lived millions upon millions of poor and tired human beings, toiling like ants who have built a nest underneath a heavy stone. They worked for the benefit of someone else. They shared their food with the animals of the fields. They lived in stables. They died without hope.[1]

In the writings of historians we find contrasting descriptions of slavery in the time of the Empire. According to some, the picture is entirely black; and after reading the descriptions, one wonders why more slaves did not commit suicide. Others have made the picture a light gray, and it would seem that slavery on the whole was so endurable that even some poverty stricken free men rejoiced at the chance of becoming other men's property. Contemporary laws and contemporary historians of the Empire present less prejudiced views of the institution. It becomes evident that the slavery of the second century and thereafter was more tolerable than the slavery of Paul's day. Most of the laws regulating the condition of these human chattels belong to the later period when manumission became more frequent.

During the years of the Republic and the early Empire the practice of exposing new-born children was common. (The first law against this procedure was legislated in A.D. 374.) While hundreds of exposed children died, large numbers were claimed by slavery. With the cessation of war on a large scale, the influx of slaves from conquered people had decreased to a mere trickle, and thus their numbers had now to be increased from within the Empire itself. Sometimes free men convicted of crime were sentenced to slavery. The commonest method of enslavement was birth itself. If the child's mother was a slave, then

---

[1]Hendrik W. Van Loon, The Story of Mankind (New York: Pocket Books Inc., 1939), p. 85.

the status of the progeny was the same, regardless of the legal position of the father.

> . . . at the beginning of the Empire slaves were still cheap, and their lives were of little value compared with the pleasures of the conqueror, whose heart had been hardened by success. To this rather than to the brutalizing influence of warfare, which may be greatly exaggerated, may be attributed the insensibility of the Roman to suffering in slavery or animal. It was the very success of Empire, the enjoyment of absolute power, that changed ruthless steadfastness to the blindness of heart which rejoices in gratuitous cruelty. . . .
>
> The lives of slaves were freely expended in the mad freaks of masters who aimed at eclipsing their predecessors or contemporaries by some gorgeous show or atrocious novelty, or attempt to perform the impossible. To give point to a jest, life or limb was accounted cheap; to demonstrate the owner's generosity, slaves were given away as presents, torn from their kindred or uprooted from surroundings where they were at last making for themselves some comfort and success.[1]

> Perhaps the greatest misuse of all of the slave systems in Rome was the cult of the gladiators, slaves encouraged and trained to fight each other or be slaughtered in dozens by a bravo, to satisfy the lust of the public for blood and excitement, and who were often whipped into the arena.[2]

During the first century the master had absolute control over his slaves. He was under no legal obligation to provide for them in sickness or in health. Out of mere caprice of master or mistress, slaves were often crucified, and this was accompanied frequently by the hacking off of limbs or the cutting out of the tongue. Such ferocity was not universal. On occasions, affectionate relations existed between master and slave. That this was the exception rather than the rule, however, is indicated by the allusions to slavery in Terence, Plautus, Petronius, Tacitus, Juvenal and Persius.

---

[1]R. H. Barrow, Slavery in the Roman Empire. (The Dial Press Inc. New York, 1928), p. 29.

[2]George MacMunn, Slavery Through the Ages. (London: Nicholson and Watson Limited, 1938), pp. 24-25.

The philosophy of the age did little to alleviate the lot of the enslaved. Aristotle had declared that the evident difference between men indicated that some were meant to be slaves, and as for Plato, in his depiction of the ideal state the institution is retained without apparently the idea ever having occurred to the author that a state could function without slaves. The attitude of the Stoics in the days of the Empire was only a slight improvement upon the attitude of Aristotle and Plato.[1] Even Cato the elder, so often exalted as a model of Pagan virtue, sold his faithful slaves once they had become so old as to be of little use to him.

About a year before Onesimus had arrived in Rome, the Prefect, Pedanius Secundus, was murdered by a slave who was his master's rival for the affections of a fellow slave. After the Senate had discussed the matter, an obsolete law was enforced which required that all the slaves of that household should be executed.

> . . . Nero sided with the Senate . . . The imperial tiger had long ago tasted blood, and relished the taste. He ordered the execution to be carried out by military force. In the sight of the whole city . . . that long line of slaves (400 in number)--old and young, men and women and children--had been led forth to die.[2]

No wonder a slave of the age exclaimed "I know the cross will be my sepulchre; all my ancestors are buried there."[3]

These reminiscences from history suggest some aspects of the problem faced by Paul as he sought to accomplish a safe homecoming for Onesimus.

---

[1]David Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul, p. 573.

[2]Farrar, Messages, p. 342.

[3]Miles Gloriosus i.4, 19 by Plautus, cited by Farrar, Messages, p. 345.

> If he returned to Colossae, Philemon, even if he were a kind-hearted man, would in no sense be transgressing the most ordinary customs of the day if he had branded Onesimus or sent him to work in chains in some stifling and horrible ergastulum, or tortured, or resold him into slavery for anything which he would fetch from a fresh master, who might treat him with the worst extremes of Pagan cruelty. He might fall into the hands of some owner, who would, without compunction, fling him into a fishpond to feed the lampreys or even nail him to a cross to feed the ravens and the kites.[1]

It would be a mistake indeed to view Philemon as one with a background of centuries of Christian culture. Christianity's mission was not to destroy existing institutions by sudden tumult but rather to sow the seeds of Christian principles which ultimately would crowd out such barbarisms as slavery. This was to take almost two millenniums. Philemon was a child of his age, and only in recent years had he become a Christian. To persuade him to forgive the slave who had absconded with some of his wealth and dissipated it amid the glamour of Rome, was no slight objective.

> The actual situation in which Paul, Philemon, and Onesimus stood at the moment when the runaway met the apostle may be illustrated from a document published in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Vol 14 (1920), No 1643 (dated 298 A.D.). Here one Aurelius Sarapammon writes to a friend, whose name has perished, as follows: "I commission you by this writ to journey to the famous city of Alexandria and search for my slave, by name. . . , about 35 years old, known to you. When you have found him you shall place him in custody, with authority to shut him up and whip him and to lay a complaint before the proper authorities against any persons who have harbored him, with a demand for satisfaction."[2]

---

[1]Farrar, Messages, p. 342.

[2]The Abingdon Bible Commentary, ed F. C. Eiselen et al. (Nashville, N.Y.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1929), p. 1292.

Analysis of the Development of Ideas, with Emphasis Upon Logos

". . . an Epistle unrivalled in tenderness, and pathos, and refined delicacy, and courtesy, --rendered more attractive by its genial playfulness of style, and breathing a divine spirit of Christian wisdom and love"[1]--such an epistle could not simultaneously bear the stamp of overt dialectic. We search this letter in vain for the measured arguments which characterized the address to the Galatians.

Logic is present in Philemon none the less, but it is the logic which impresses the mind through suggestion rather than by obvious and direct statement. The proposition made by Paul is--"Philemon, you ought to forgive this runaway slave who has wronged you." See verses 15-17. The rationale implied in the letter is as follows.

You should forgive Onesimus because:

1. He has become a Christian, (and all Christians are equal in God's sight.
2. He has become specially dear to me, Paul.
3. Circumstances indicate that it was God's providence that your slave ran away, and met me here in Rome.
4. There is no real necessity that he should risk returning to you, but both he and I think it is the right thing to do. So don't take advantage of this.
5. You are indebted to me because I brought you the gospel and to grant my wish in this matter would be a fitting act of gratitude.
6. I hope to visit you and Onesimus when I get out of prison. This will be a happy occasion only if I find that you have become reconciled to Onesimus.

---

[1]Wordsworth, Vol. II, p. 335.

This rationale is based on concepts that are particularly Christian in nature--the concept that a Christian is marked by an attitude of love and forbearance to his fellow men; that gratitude is a constant mainspring of action; that all believers are equal in God's sight; that events do not just "happen" but are overruled by the providence of God; that a Christian's chief concern is the same as Christ's, the redeeming of humanity; and finally, that Christianity makes a man a gentleman. These concepts are significant to the rhetorical critic. As Croft has written:

> Human values can be talked about only as constellations of attitude moving through qualitative changes in historical continuity. The effort to comprehend this "history of ideas" is at the center of speech criticism, for rhetorical adaptation can be understood only on the basis of an adequate historical perspective on these germinal values.[1]

Let us now consider the manner in which Paul makes mention of these ideas. He:

> . . . enters on this delicate subject with many precautions. It is a siege in all form. He refrains from immediately stating the object of his request. He first reminds Philemon what he is who addresses him (vv. 8, 9); then he speaks to him of him for whom he addresses him (vv. 10-16). And it is only after having thus made the approaches that he delivers the assault by pronouncing the great word proslabou receive him (vv. 17-21).[2]

Because the address is brief, it may best be studied in verse sequence.

> Paul, a prisoner for Christ Jesus, and Timothy our brother,
> To Philemon our beloved fellow worker and Apphia our sister and
> Archippus our fellow soldier, and the church in your house:
> Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.[3]

---

[1]Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLII (October, 1956), pp. 283-291.

[2]Godet, p. 454. It is recognized that this quotation has reference to Dispositio but it is included here as being also applicable to the development of ideas.

[3]RSV, Philemon, vv1-3

The writer is revealed as a friend imprisoned for the gospel's sake. In almost every other address, the words "an apostle" follow the reference to Paul's name. To convey the concept of friendliness rather than authority, the salutation is couched in this unofficial form. It is peculiarly appropriate that Paul should refer to himself as "a bondsman of Jesus Christ" (as the passage may be translated) in an address where he pleads on behalf of a bond-slave.

Philemon is described both as "beloved" and a "fellow-worker." The first adjective embodies a Greek root which occurs five times in these twenty-five verses. This word agapē is the key to the epistle, and reveals the theme which could be summarized thus: "a debt of love is owed by believers to one another." Because Philemon is beloved by Paul, he would probably desire to respond to that love by granting the apostle's request. The term "fellow-worker" implies that Philemon was actively engaged in Christian endeavour. Perhaps he led in worship the little church group which met in his house. As such he was the more obligated to fulfill every Christian duty, particularly the obligation of love toward others. Paul intimates that this fellow worker will not now belie his example as a Church leader. Instead, he will set an example of Christian love by his forgiveness of Onesimus.

Apphia is apparently the wife of Philemon, judging from the association of her name here with Philemon. Archippus also was probably a member of the family, and a minister of the gospel as denoted by Paul's use of the term "fellowsoldier." (Used elsewhere by Paul of Epaphroditus Phil 2:25; and of Timothy 2 Tim. 2:3. Compare Col. 4:18 which refers to this same Archippus and says "fulfil the ministry which thou hast received from the Lord.")

"The church in your house." In the great cities of the Roman Empire, large gatherings of the Christians would have excited suspicion

and it was customary for the believers to meet in groups of varying sizes, most frequently in large homes of leading Christians.

> Both in the Old and New Testament ekklesia implies a community based upon a special religious idea, and established in a special way. The word is also used in N. T. of a single church or assembly, or of a church confined to a particular place, as the church in the house of Prisca and Aquila (Rom. xvi. 5), or of Philemon as here; the church at Corinth, Jerusalem, etc. In these assemblies in private houses messages and letters from the apostles were announced or read. It is perhaps to the address of this letter to a congregational circle, as well as to an individual correspondent, that we are indebted for its preservation.[1]

Possibly one reason that Paul addresses this message to the local church as well as to Philemon was to create added pressure upon the latter to fulfill the request of the Apostle.

> I thank my God always when I remember you in my prayers, because I hear of your love and of the faith which you have toward the Lord Jesus and all the saints, and I pray that the sharing of your faith may promote the knowledge of all the good that is ours in Christ. For I have derived much joy and comfort from your love, my brother, because the hearts of the saints have been refreshed through you.[2]

Paul affirms that constantly in his prayers he mentions Philemon with gratitude for the good report he has heard concerning him. The mention of faith in connection with an attitude to believers as well as to Christ has puzzled many students but the explanation consists in the probability that we have here a chiasmus where the extremes and means each correspond. Thus it could be arranged "love to all the saints, and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ." Theologically speaking, the faith should first be mentioned as the root of all actions acceptable to

---

[1]Marvin R. Vincent, Philippians and Philemon, The International Critical Commentary, (Edinburgh: 1950), p. 177.

[2]RSV, Philemon, vv. 4-7.

God. Paul, however, mentions love first, because the objective of this message is to motivate Philemon to an act of love.

Thus Paul refers to the good reputation of this leading believer in Colosse, and delicately expresses his hope that the same loving attitude will continue to be manifested. Ethos is here working in reverse, with Paul building up the character of the chief member of the audience in order that the latter might strive to live up to his good name.

Judging from verse seven, Philemon has become famous for his hospitality. News of it has even reached Paul in Rome, hundreds of miles away. The logical implication of the prayer of the Apostle is that the love and faith which has cheered "the hearts of the saints" will be "shared" with the returning absconder, although the slave as yet has not even been named.

> And although I could rely on my authority in Christ and dare to order you to do what I consider right, I am not doing that. No, I am appealing to that love of yours, a simple personal appeal from Paul the old man, in prison for Jesus Christ's sake.[1]

As an Apostle, Paul could rightly order the believer to comply with the request he is about to make. Philemon was indebted to him for his conversion, and their relationship had long been one of intimacy (v 17). On these grounds Paul's slightest wish should have been tantamount in effect, (though not in expression), to a direct command. Such is the implication in these verses. The Greek word translated "right" by Phillips (anēkon) has been adroitly chosen. It literally means "that which is fitting." The inference is that it is no unreasonable request that the Apostle is about to make. It is one that is altogether appropriate and fitting, and therefore it should be fulfilled without delay or questioning.

---

[1]J. B. Phillips, Letter to Young Churches (New York: Macmillan Company, 1948), p. 157, Philemon verses 8, 9.

Once more we have a repetition of the key word of this letter--love. It is "for love's sake" as most versions translate it, that Philemon should hasten to comply with the coming injunction. Elsewhere Paul had written of love as the pre-eminent virtue of Christians. Without it, eloquence, knowledge, faith, zeal counted for nothing. He had described love as follows:

> Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never faileth:[1]

Christ also had declared that this virtue of love was to be known as the distinguishing badge of believers in Him.[2] Therefore, when Paul appeals to love as the basis for Philemon's attitude to Onesimus, he is building upon premises already accepted by the slave-owner. The latter professed to worship a supreme Deity whose chief attribute was love.[3] If his worship was sincere, his own attitude should bear the same stamp. The conduct which Paul proposes thus becomes "a reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1). This is doubly the case when the source of the request is pointed out to be Philemon's personal friend who is not only an Apostle but also one who has been prematurely aged by excessive labours, and who at this present time is confined to a prison by Nero. Obviously the main appeal here is ethical in nature, but there are also present strong indications that the proposed conduct would be the only rational behavior that could be pursued by Philemon, a professing Christian, in view of the circumstances surrounding the request.

---

[1]KJV, 1 Corinthians 13:4-8.

[2]John 13:34-35.

[3]1 John 4:8.

In effect, the Apostle in these opening verses is suggesting to Philemon the following reasons for his pardoning the slave.

1. Christians worship a God of love and therefore must themselves be loving in attitude.
2. You have already shown your love to many. Therefore it is naturally expected you will continue to manifest this attitude.
3. Besides this, the present request is one that in itself is anēkon--fitting. You are not being asked to do something that would be inappropriate.
4. And remember who it is that makes this request. It is an Apostle, a leader of the Faith. It is Paul, who brought you the Gospel, and gave you the hope of eternal life. It is an aged warrior, worn with the strenuous unselfish labours of many years. It is a prisoner soon to be tried for his life and perhaps face the executioner's block. Naturally you will want to please him.

> I appeal to you for my child, Onesimus, whose father I have become in my imprisonment.[1]
>
> I am appealing for my child. Yes I have become a father though I have been under lock and key, and the child's name is--Onesimus![2]

The order of the words in the Phillips translation is preferable to that of the RSV, for the original Greek has the name of the runaway placed last. This is skillfully done, the purpose being first to give a favourable description of the escapee before pronouncing the name that would inevitably stir unpleasant memories.

Paul continues with his implied reasons for forgiving Onesimus. He asserts:

---

[1]RSV, verse 10.

[2]Phillips, verse 10.

1. I count Onesimus as my spiritual child, and therefore Philemon, you should treat the slave with respect.
2. The slave has become a Christian. He has been "born again." Therefore, all other Christians should rejoice over him and love him.
3. The circumstances of the conversion of Onesimus are so extraordinary as to betoken the special intervention of Providence. Who would expect that while I, Paul, am a prisoner in chains, I would be able to convert an escapee and thief!

These are the implications of this aptly worded verse. Next follows a parenthesis.

> Verse 11 (Formerly he was useless to you, but now he is indeed useful to you and to me.)[1]

As the RSV points out in a footnote, the meaning of Onesimus is "useful." The Apostle is softening the blow of the mention of the slave's name by a spark of humour. He puns upon the meaning of the patronymic. It is not, however, humour alone that is involved. In effect the Apostle is providing another reason for the forgiveness of the runaway. That reason is the fact that the slave has become a new person. He is no longer a rascal. He has become a genuine Christian whose hallmark is usefulness. Therefore, he should not be treated as though still a thief. Onesimus is now "profitable" both to the Apostle and to his owner ("to you and to me.") He is profitable to Paul inasmuch as he has already ministered to the aged prisoner. He will probably be profitable to Philemon in the future. Such is the sign reasoning involved.

> Verse 12. I am sending him back to you, sending my very heart.[2]

---

[1]RSV, verse 11.

[2]Ibid., verse 12.

This intensifies the preceding by repeating the thought that the slave is as dear to the Apostle as his own son.

> I would have been glad to keep him with me, in order that he might serve me on your behalf during my imprisonment for the gospel but I preferred to do nothing without your consent in order that your goodness might not be by compulsion but of your own free will.[1]

> I should have dearly loved to have kept him with me; he could have done what you would have done--looked after me here in prison for the Gospel's sake. But I would do nothing without consulting you first, for if you have a favour to give me, let it be spontaneous and not forced from you by circumstances![2]

Paul reasons that it would have been possible, and to his advantage, to have retained Onesimus as his aid. Such an act could have been excused by rationalising that, after all, Philemon himself would have been happy to have ministered to the Apostle had he had the opportunity. Therefore there could be nothing wrong in permitting the slave, Philemon's property, to supply this service. This is the implication of "that he might serve me on your behalf" or as the KJV has it--"in thy stead." This is followed up with the courteous expression of the fact that the Apostle would not so presume of the friendship of the absent Colossian.

> Here, again, there is a certain delicacy of suggestion. A slave was his master's property; he could act only on his master's behalf and by his consent. St. Paul is sure that Philemon's love for him would have gladly given that consent, and so made Onesimus an instrument of willing service to St. Paul. . . . He will not keep Onesimus and ask that consent by letter, lest it should be "as it were of necessity"; i.e. lest it should wear even the semblance of constraint.[3]

---

[1]Ibid., verses 13, 14.

[2]Phillips, verses 13, 14.

[3]Barry, Ellicotts, Vol. VIII, p. 273.

> Verses 15, 16. Perhaps this is why he was parted from you for a while, that you might have him back for ever, no longer as a slave, but more than a slave, as a beloved brother, especially to me but how much more to you, both in the flesh and in the Lord.[1]

> It occurs to me that there has been a purpose in your losing him. You lost him, a slave, for a time; now you are having him back for good, not merely a slave, but as a brother-Christian. He is already especially loved by me--how much more will you be able to love him, both as a man and as a fellow-Christian![2]

Paul employs sign reasoning once more. He says in effect that the indications are such as to indicate the Hand of Providence in the whole situation. Therefore, Philemon should be quick to acknowledge such, and co-operate with the Divine purposes. Notice that Paul does not say the slave "ran away" or "escaped." He uses a phrase which is both euphemistic and suggestive of an overruling providence. The slave was merely "parted from Philemon for a while," in order that the latter "might have him back for ever, no longer as a slave, but more than a slave. . . ."

> Onesimus' time of absence, however long, was but a short "hour" (so Greek) compared with the everlasting devotion henceforth binding him to his master.[3]

How delicately the Apostle suggests the manumission of the slave! He asks the master to receive him back as "more than a slave." This thought reveals one of the basic concepts of the letter--namely, the equality of all men in Christ. It was no part of the mission of Christianity to force men to change their institutions. It was, however, its mission to motivate men to experience "the power of love" rather than the "love of power." Thus its reforms would of necessity be gradual, beginning with

---

[1]RSV, verses 15, 16.

[2]Phillips, verses 15, 16.

[3]Barry, Ellicott's, p. 273.

the implanting of principles which would gradually transform all who accepted them, until the whole world was leavened with the fruit of the Gospel. Thus this epistle does not condemn slavery, but it reveals concepts which once understood, would abolish every kind of injustice and tyranny. One writer, commenting on verse 16, has declared

> In these words we have at last the principle which is absolutely destructive of the condition of slavery--a condition which is the exaggeration of natural inferiority to the effacement of the deeper natural equality. (1) The slave--the "living chattel" of inhuman laws and philosophies--is first "a brother," united to his master by natural ties of ultimate equality, having, therefore, both duties and rights. (2) But he is also a "brother beloved." These natural ties are not only strengthened by duty, but made living ties by the love which delights indeed to respect the rights of others, but is not content without willingness to sacrifice even our own rights to them. (3) Above all, this is "in the Lord." The slave is bought by Christ's blood, made a son of God, and therefore a brother to all who are members of the family of God. To reject and to outrage him is a rejection and outrage towards Christ. Compare St. Peter's striking comparison of the sufferings of the slave to the passion of Divine Sufferer (1 Pet. ii 18-24). They suffer with Him, and He suffers in them. It has been proved historically that only by the aid of this last and highest conception has the brotherhood of love--too slowly, indeed, but yet surely--assumed reality.[1]

The implicit reasoning of this last verse is based on the assertion that a Christian is equal to every other Christian in God's sight, and therefore believers should have regard for one another on the same basis. Thus Philemon should grant the regenerated Onesimus his freedom.

> Verses 17-20. So if you consider me your partner, receive him as you would receive me. If he has wronged you at all, or owes you anything, charge that to my account. I, Paul, write this with my own hand, I will repay it--to say nothing of your owing me even your own self. Yes, brother, I want some benefit from you in the Lord. Refresh my heart in Christ.[2]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 273.

[2]RSV, verses 17-20.

> You and I have so much in common, haven't we? Then do welcome him as you would welcome me. If you feel he has wronged or cheated you put it down to my account. I've written this with my own hand: I, Paul, hereby promise to repay you. (Of course, I'm not stressing the fact that you might be said to owe me your very soul!) Now do grant me this favour, my brother--such an act of love will do my old heart good. As I send you this letter I know you'll do what I ask.[1]

The Apostle now reaches the height of his appeal. He reasons from analogy when he suggests that Philemon should consider what treatment he would give the Apostle, and then transfer the same attitude to Onesimus. It is intimated that their own close friendship made the granting of his request a reasonable and probable procedure. Furthermore, as regards what has been stolen, Philemon need not fear the loss of that, for Paul is prepared to pay it back if so required. None the less he reminds Philemon that it is he who actually is Paul's debtor. As though writing a promissory note, Paul borrows the quill from his amanuensis, and writes the fact that he is prepared to replenish the amount stolen.

> It does not follow from this sentence that the whole of this Epistle was written with the Apostle's own hand; rather it would seem, that he made this engagement of repayment to be more emphatic and significant by distinguishing it from the rest of the Epistle, and by taking the pen from the hand of his secretary, and by inditing that particular clause with his own autograph, well known to Philemon.[2] (emphasis his)

There is an interesting transition in verse nineteen, where the Apostle adds to his promise the words--"to say nothing of your owing me even your own self."

> Here St. Paul escapes from the business-like promise of the last verse in the freer atmosphere of spiritual relations. He knew that this promise it was right for him to offer, but wrong

---

[1]Phillips, verses 17-20.

[2]Wordsworth, p. 339.

> for Philemon to accept. Philemon owed his own self--his new self in Christ--to the Apostle. In that was a debt which he could not repay, but would rejoice even in this smaller matter to acknowledge.[1]

The letter continues:

> Confident of your obedience, I write to you, knowing that you will do even more than I say.[2]

Here is another transition, this time a transition in tone. Almost imperceptibly the Apostle has glided from the tone of appeal to a friend to that of authority from a superior. He refers now to "obedience." Nothing is being left to chance. Paul has appealed to the love of Philemon for himself and for the God he worshipped. Now he adds a delicate allusion to the fact that Philemon's deference for his apostleship will confirm his desire to comply with the request. By the reference to Philemon's doing even more than requested it is gently suggested once more that not only should the slave be kindly received but he should be given his freedom.

> At the same time, prepare a guest room for me, for I am hoping through your prayers to be granted to you.[3]

Almost as a postscript Paul adds these words. The words do not in themselves imply that the guest room should be at Philemon's own home. The Greek word here used often signifies "hospitality" generally, and the sentence itself literally interpreted is only a request that Philemon arrange some particular place for Paul. Nevertheless, both Philemon and the Apostle were aware that it would be natural for the former to offer such hospitality in his own house. The implication of the request is that when Paul appears on Philemon's doorstep (if he should be released from prison), he would want to know the condition of the slave, as well as that of his host.

---

[1] Barry, Ellicott, p. 274.

[2] RSV, v. 21.

[3] RSV, v. 22.

It is doubtful whether the greatest living psychologist could devise an entreaty half as powerful as that constituted by this letter. It is a model of Christian courtesy and sweet reasonableness. The logic of it is implicit rather than blatant and the Apostle refuses to use arguments of a bludgeoning nature.

Analysis of Pathos

The very setting of this message has obvious pathetic factors which aid the accomplishment of the Apostle's purpose. As has been previously mentioned, the Apostle of the Gentiles, who for almost thirty years had tirelessly proclaimed the gospel, wasnow confined to a Roman prison, and chained to a Roman guard. That irresponsible enemy of the Christians, Nero, sat on the imperial throne, and the Apostle had no natural grounds for expecting clemency. Despite the exigency of his situation, Paul prosecuted his evangelistic work, teaching the gospel to his Roman guards, and to visitors. In this letter we find his heart so completely at rest from himself that he has set himself the task of persuading the wronged slavemaster to forgive the slave escapee. Considering the natural love that his converts held for him, this present predicament of the Apostle's could not but intensify their sympathies towards him. Probably from the very household of Philemon's there had arisen countless prayers on behalf of the prisoner's release.

Paul is not unaware of this situation as he faces the task of persuading Philemon regarding Onesimus. In the first line of his message he makes reference to his situation. It is "Paul, a prisoner for Christ Jesus" who addresses Philemon and the church at his house. Further on in his address he refers to "Paul the aged and now also a prisoner" (v 9 KJV and RSV footnote). In verses 10, 13, and 23, his imprisonment

is again mentioned. Undoubtedly Paul hopes to intensify the love and sympathy of his hearers in order that Onesimus might share some of the affection felt towards the Apostle.[1] The latter was aware that:

> Mankind makes far more determinations through hatred, or love, or desire, or anger, or grief, or joy, or hope, or fear, or error, or some other affection of mind, than from regard to truth, or any settled maxim, or principles of right, or judicial form, or adherence to the laws.[2]

One of the most effective means of arousing emotion within an audience is for the speaker to exhibit the emotions he desires to see in others. This Paul does. His affection and sympathy pervade his message, and there are no indications that these are synthetic. He appears to do naturally that which great actors feign. Note, for example, his use of the word "love" throughout the letter. Consider also the description of his prayers in verses 4-7. The manner in which he identifies the slave with himself is the strongest of all demonstrations in the letter of the Apostle's expansive affections and sympathies. Philemon is ever addressed with courtesy and affection (see for example verses 2, 4-7, 14).

The third aspect of pathetic appeal in his address is the stress upon religious beliefs. Luther caught this emphasis and expressed it as follows:

> This Epistle showeth a right, noble, lovely example of Christian love. Here we see how St. Paul layeth himself out for the poor Onesimus, and with all his means pleadeth his cause with his master, and so setteth himself as if he were Onesimus, and had himself done wrong to Philemon. Yet all this doeth he, not with

---

[1]These passages obviously have strong ethical as well as pathetic appeal.

[2]Cicero, De Oratore II:42.

> force, as if he had right thereto, but he stripped himself of his right, and thus enforceth Philemon to forego his right also. Even as Christ did for us with God the Father, thus also doth St, Paul for Onesimus with Philemon: for Christ also stripped Himself of His right, and by love and humility enforced (?) the Father to lay aside His wrath and power, and to take us to His grace for the sake of Christ, who lovingly pleadeth our cause, and with all His heart layeth Himself out for us; for we are all His Onesimi, to my thinking.[1]

Thus does Paul build upon the beliefs of his listeners regarding Christian virtues. They already believe that love is the sign of true discipleship. He exhorts that this sign be now displayed. Philemon believes in the Christian ethic of forgiveness. Paul urges that he now manifest it. Each of these Colossian believers names himself as a brother to all other believers. Paul suggests that the present case will put their "brotherliness" to the test. Furthermore, Philemon and his house acknowledge that a Supreme Providence overrules all the events of this life. This too is made to minister to Paul's motivating appeal (v. 15).

The Apostle also seeks to motivate in other ways than through religious beliefs and altruism. In the following verses he appeals to the desires for social status, group approval, gregariousness and friendship (2, 5-7, 22-24). Humour is employed in the puns of verses 12 and 20, gratitude is appealed to in verse 19, emulation in verses 9-12. It may be said that verse 18 would be classified by some as an appeal to acquisitiveness, but we doubt if the Apostle believed that Philemon would accept the offer. It is rather a gesture of courtesy. In verse 21 we have a further appeal to reputation, while verse 22 the motive of self-preservation is applied.

The list of motives in these last paragraphs should not be construed as constituting the primary pathetic appeal of this address.

---

[1]Luther, cited by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, Commentary on the Whole Bible, p. 436.

They are secondary. Absolutely primary in this instance is the appeal to the love existing between Paul and the believers, and the appeal to religious beliefs.

Analysis of Ethos

> One is accustomed to imagine the apostle as always armed for war, loaded with logic and bristling with arguments. We like to come upon him at rest, in a moment of relaxation in that intercourse of friendship full of abandonment and even of playfulness.[1]

It is obvious that ethical and pathetic appeals run parallel in several places in this discourse. For example, the situation of the aged Apostle as a prisoner for Christ's sake has strong ethical as well as pathetic overtones. Similarly, the Apostle's expressions of love were not only calculated to create emotive responses but also to establish convictions regarding his own good-will towards his hearers. As Thonssen and Baird have written "ethos and pathos have, indeed, much in common."[2] We shall now view the discourse with reference to manifestations of ethos.

> Verse 1: Paul, a prisoner for Christ Jesus, and Timothy our brother.[3]

The simple appellation of "Paul," minus the usual addition of his apostleship, is rich in ethical significance. In effect it declares "Here is a friendly letter. I forbare to use my official status because my request is a personal one, and I trust you will listen to me as an equal rather than as a church-leader. For friendship's sake consider this appeal." The salutation betokens good will and humility by its amiable simplicity. The expression "a prisoner for Christ Jesus" probably

---

[1]M. Sabatier, cited by F. Godet, in Introduction to the New Testament, p. 460.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, p. 386.

[3]RSV, verse 2.

conjured up in the minds of the hearers the picture of one who had laboured long and well in the service of God, and who as a result was imprisoned by the pagans. As the first part of the salutation suggested character and good-will, this section indicates character and competence. The Roman government evidently views this prisoner with respect. They have not killed him out of hand, and they have permitted him the privilege of receiving and despatching messages.

> Verse 2: To Philemon our beloved fellow worker . . . Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.[1]

It is no mean accomplishment to write serenely regarding "grace and peace" in full knowledge of the fact that at any moment one might be called to place one's head on the executioner's block. The salutation is affectionate as well as serene. It is as "our beloved fellow worker" that Paul considers Philemon. The speaker appears as one full of good will with a heart at rest from himself. Consider, for example, the following reference to his intercession in prayer for Philemon.

> Verses 4-7: I think my God always when I remember you in my prayers, because I hear of your love and of the faith which you have toward the Lord Jesus and all the saints, and I pray that the sharing of your faith may promote the knowledge of all the good that is ours in Christ. For I have derived much joy and comfort from your love, my brother, because the hearts of the saints have been refreshed through you.[2]

Not the least evidences of Paul's good character is manifested in this letter are the constant religious allusions. In the words of Thonssen and Baird he "associates . . . himself . . . [and] his message with what is virtuous and elevated."[3] The Divine titles, religious

---

[1]RSV, verses 2, 3.

[2]RSV, verses 4-7.

[3]Thonssen and Baird, p. 387.

practices or beliefs are alluded to in almost every verse. In this section, for example, he refers to God, the Lord Jesus, love, faith, prayer, service and hospitality. These verses not only suggest the good character of Paul, but they portray his goodwill towards Philemon and "all the saints."

> Verses 8-10: Accordingly, though I am bold enough in Christ to command you to do what is required, yet for love's sake I prefer to appeal to you--I, Paul, an ambassador and now a prisoner also for Christ Jesus--I appeal to you for my child, Onesimus, whose father I have become in my imprisonment.[1]

The reference to himself as "Paul the aged and now also a prisoner" repeats the appeal made in the introduction. "Yet for love's sake I prefer to appeal to you" is the language of tact and good-will. This, and the many other indications of tact in the discourse, are manifestations of sagacity or competence.

> . . . a speaker helps to establish the impression of sagacity if he (1) uses what is popularly called common sense; (2) acts with tact and moderation; (3) displays a sense of good taste. . . .[2]

Other indications of this are found in the Apostle's gradual approach to the subject of his letter. He does not blurt out the name of Onesimus with his first breath. Instead, the slave is not mentioned till the message is almost half-way through. The appeal is not voiced until indications of the speaker's own affection for Philemon have been thoroughly manifested. The language of entreaty is chosen rather than that of authority. Paul professes confidence that his request will be complied with (v. 21). All these are intimations of the "competence" of Paul.

". . . my child, Onesimus, whose father I have become in my imprisonment." These words bear witness regarding each constituent

---

[1]RSV, verses 8-10.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, p. 387.

of ethos. Character is suggested, for here is a man still labouring for others while in dire distress himself. Competence is indicated, because the aged worker was able to convert even a recalcitrant slave, and this was accomplished in unfavourable surroundings. Thirdly, good-will for all men is revealed, for it is evident that one who could champion a representative of the dregs of society must have a great affection for mankind.

> Verse 11: (Formerly he was useless to you, but now he is indeed useful to you and to me.)[1]

Most of us enjoy humor shown on a stage, but humor from a prison is much more striking. As has been mentioned, the meaning of Onesimus is "useful." We admire most the man who can be cheerful and even playful when circumstances seem against him. And usually, believers are relieved and encouraged when they find manifestations of their common humanity in "great" leaders. Verse 20 repeats the pun in another way.

> Verse 12: I am sending him back to you, sending my very heart.[2]

Here is the greatest Christian of the age referring to an escapee slave and thief as "his very heart." To a thoughtful person the ethical considerations suggested are powerful indeed.

> Verses 13, 14: I would have been glad to keep him with me, in order that he might serve me on your behalf during my imprisonment for the gospel; but I preferred to do nothing without your consent in order that your goodness might not be by compulsion but of your own free will.[3]

While he had every excuse to retain Onesimus, the Apostle refused to do so. He will not take an unfair advantage to the slightest degree.

> Verses 15, 16: Perhaps this is why he was parted from you for a while that you might have him back forever, no longer a slave, . . .

---

[1]RSV, verse 11.

[2]Ibid., verse 12.

[3]Ibid., verses 13, 14.

> as a beloved brother, especially to me but how much more to you, both in the flesh and in the Lord.[1]

Paul is a believer in a Providence that does all things well. The use of "beloved" once more should be noted. In the introduction he used the adjective with reference to the master. Here it is used concerning the slave.

> Verses 17-20: So if you consider me your partner, receive him as you would receive me. If he has wronged you at all, or owes you anything, charge that to my account. I, Paul, write this with my own hand, I will repay it--to say nothing of your owing me even your own self. Yes, brother, I want some benefit from you in the Lord. Refresh my heart in Christ.[2]

Sympathy, generosity, and trust are indicated by these words. The picture of the aged and worn prisoner offering recompense from his own probably scant store has considerable ethical appeal.

> Verses 21-22: Confident of your obedience, I write to you, knowing that you will do even more than I say. At the same time, prepare a guest room for me, for I am hoping through your prayers to be granted to you.[3]

Paul expresses confidence in his "fellow worker" and hopefully declares that he will visit him if the latter's prayers for his freedom are answered. Thus the letter closes as it began, with emphasis upon the intimate relationship existing between Paul and Philemon.

Reviewing the whole, we question whether any discourse of similar length has ever approached this one in its marvellous content of personal resources.

> . . . we may notice the beautiful light which this letter throws upon the character of St. Paul. We see him here in private life; in the sweet and genial intercourse which he held with the friends whom he loved. We see how very far Christianity is

---

[1]Ibid., verses 15, 16.

[2]Ibid., verses 17-20.

[3]Ibid., verses 21-22.

from interfering with the exquisite courtesies and refinements of daily intercourse. We see--let us repeat it--in the best and truest sense of the word what a gentleman Paul was.[1]

Appendix to Section on Ethical Appeal

The closest known approach to Paul's letter is another epistle written by a contemporary concerning a runaway slave. This is the famous letter of Pliny to Sabinianus. We include a translation of this letter and a quotation concerning the contrast between its ethical manifestations and those of Paul's letter to Philemon.

"C. Plinius to his Sabinianus, greeting:--

Your freedman, with whom, as you had told me, you were vexed, came to me, and, flinging himself at my feet, clung to them as though they had been yours. He wept much, entreated much, yet at the same time left much unsaid, and, in short, convinced me that he was sincerely sorry. I believe that he is really reformed, because he is now conscious of his delinquency. You are angry, I know; justly angry, that too I know; but gentleness is most praiseworthy exactly where anger is most justifiable. You loved the poor fellow, and I hope will love him again; meanwhile, it is enough to yield to intercession. Should he ever deserve it you may be angry again, and all the more excusably by yielding now. Make some allowance for his youth, for his tears, for your own kindly disposition. Do not torture him, lest you torture yourself as well, for it is a torture to you when one of your kindly nature is angry. I fear you will think that I am not asking but forcing you if I join my prayers to his; I will, however, do so, and all the more fully and unreservedly in proportion to the sharpness and severity with which I took him to task, sternly threatening that I would never say a word for him again. That I said to him because he needed to be well frightened; but I do not say it to you, for perhaps I shall say a word for him again, and again gain my point; provided only my request be such as it becomes me to ask and you to grant. Farewell![2]

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 349.

[2]Ibid., p. 734.

> That exquisitely natural and beautifully-written letter does credit both to Pliny's heart and to his head, and yet polished as it is in style, while St. Paul's is written with a sort of noble carelessness of expression, it stands for beauty and value far below the letter to Philemon. In the first place, it is for a young freedman who had been deeply beloved, and not for a runaway slave. In the next place, it is purely individual, and wholly wanting in the large divine principle which underlies the letter of St. Paul. And there are other marked differences. Paul has no doubt whatever about the future good conduct of Onesimus; but Pliny thinks that the young freedman may offend again. Pliny assumes that Sabinianus is and will be angry; Paul has no such fear about Philemon. Paul pleads on the broad ground of Humanity redeemed in Christ; Pliny pleads the youth and the tears of the freedman, and the affection which his master once felt for him. Paul does not think it necessary to ask Philemon to spare punishment; Pliny has to beg his friend not to use torture. Paul has no reproaches for Onesimus; Pliny severely scolded his young suppliant, and told him--without meaning to keep his word--that he should never intercede for him again. The letter of Pliny is the letter of an excellent Pagan; but the differences which separate the Pagan from the Christian stand out in every line.[1]

Analysis of Arrangement

Throughout the preceding analysis, mention has been made of the psychological arrangement of Paul's materials in this discourse. We would now summarise the evidence which leads us to this conclusion.

Obviously the arrangement is informal in pattern. It is neither historical, distributive, or logical. If any adjective is to be applied it is the word "psychological." By psychological arrangement we mean an ordering of ideas that takes fully into account the motives, emotions, and prejudices of the listeners and is calculated to apply, convert, or allay these respectively during the process of persuasion. Its external arrangement is that of most New Testament letters plus the typical

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 627-628.

section of thanksgiving which almost invariably accompanies a Pauline epistle. Thus we have:

(1) Salutation--verses 1-3.

(2) Thanksgiving--verses 4-7.

(3) Body--verses 8-20. In this instance the body is constituted of intercession for the runaway slave.

(4) Conclusion and farewell--verses 21-25.

The most significant feature of the arrangement is that Paul with great courtesy and tact prepares the way for his ultimate plea of "receive him." These words occur in the 17th verse after Paul has (1) alluded to his own position as a prisoner, (2) expressed his love for Philemon and the church which met at his house, (3) indicated the providential purpose in the flight of Onesimus, and (4) intimated that the slave is now a changed man. The very name of the runaway is withheld until the Apostle is almost half-way through his letter.

Even in single verses the arrangement of the words is often significant. In verse 10, for example, it has been pointed out that the name Onesimus is restricted in the original Greek to the very last place in the sentence. Paul first calls him "his child" and affirms that he has spiritually sired him while prisoner and then, and not till then, he pronounces the word--Onesimus.

For an informal friendly address that has nevertheless a very definite purpose of persuasion, it is doubtful whether the arrangement could be greatly improved.[1]

Results

Nowhere in Scripture do we have a direct statement concerning the results of this letter. Tradition, however, suggests that the letter

---

[1]The style of Philemon is specifically discussed in chapter six.

was successful in its purpose. Onesimus has been identified both as a later bishop of Ephesus (not far from Colosse), and of Beroea. At least two of the ancient manuscripts of this letter add the postscript that Onesimus was ultimately martyred at Rome by having both of his legs broken upon the rack.

> The fact also, that the Epistle to Philemon was communicated by him to the Church of his own City, and was publicly read in the Church in the age of Philemon, and has continued to be so read to this day, authorizes us to conclude, that the hopes of the Apostle were realized, that his petition was granted, and that the Christian slave Onesimus was welcomed as a brother by his Christian master Philemon, and by the Christian Church of Colosse.
>
> This conclusion is confirmed by the circumstance already mentioned, that the house of Philemon at Colosse, to which Onesimus returned, was long afterwards pointed out to the affectionate memory of the faithful.[1]

It is the long range effect of this epistle that we consider to be the most significant. It played a prominent part in the work of slave-emancipation. William Wilberforce and almost every chief anti-slavery agitator used Philemon as one of his strongest arguments. Granted that the letter does not condemn slavery, it does however suggest principles which, once accepted, cause slavery to fall. By christianizing the master, the Gospel has enfranchised the slave, and it is this discourse which best demonstrates the process.

---

[1]Wordsworth, p. 335.

CHAPTER VI

THE STYLE OF THE DISCOURSES

As mentioned in the introduction to the analyses contained in Chapter V, the detailed discussion of Paul's style has been reserved for separate treatment. This analysis, therefore, is the complement of the preceding chapter by virtue of its purpose to give attention to the canon of style.

We would first ask such questions as: What is style? Do the ancients and the moderns agree in their concepts regarding it? Are there some prerequisites and some constituents of style which are agreed upon by the majority of speech critics?

The ancients appear to have given more attention to defining the elements of style than in suggesting a comprehensive definition of style itself. Thomas Wilson included in the first comprehensive treatment of rhetoric in our language this definition: "Elocution, is an appliyng of apte woordes and sentences to the matter, founde out to confirme the cause. ."[1] In the eighteenth century, however, we find the following:

> Eloquence hath always been considered, and very justly, as having a particular connexion with language. It is the intention of eloquence to convey our sentiments into the minds of others, in order to produce a certain effect upon them. Language is the only vehicle by which this conveyance can be

---

[1]Cited in Selected Readings in Rhetoric and Public Speaking, edited by Lester Thonssen (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1942), p. 175.

> made. The art of speaking, then, is not less necessary to the orator than the art of thinking. Without the latter, the former could not have existed; without the former, the latter would be ineffective.[1]

It could justly be deduced from these words that style is the manner whereby thought is expressed in language in order to produce a certain effect upon listeners or readers.

Hugh Blair was more specific. He affirmed concerning style:

> The best definition I can give of it is, the peculiar manner in which a man expresses his conceptions, by means of Language. It is different from mere Language or words. The words which an author employs, may be proper and faultless; and his Style may, nevertheless, have great faults: it may be dry or stiff, or feeble, or affected. Style has always some reference to an author's manner of thinking. It is a picture of the ideas which rise in his mind, and of the manner in which they rise there; and, hence, when we are examining an author's composition, it is, in many cases, extremely difficult to separate the style from the sentiment. No wonder these two should be so intimately connected, as Style is nothing else than that sort of expression which our thoughts most readily assume.[2]

We would specially note in this definition the statement that "style has always some reference to an author's manner of thinking." Thus Blair intimates that there is a very close connection between style and invention. Indeed, it is possible that an attempt to discuss style on its own is an attempt to separate the inseparable. Certain it is that there can be no great style without great thoughts. Adequate invention is the primary underlying requirement (not "characteristic") of style. If we accept the theory that we think in words, the relationship between style and invention is even more apparent.

---

[1]George Campbell, The Philosophy of Rhetoric (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1871), p. 162.

[2]Thonssen, Selected Readings, p. 251.

"Longinus" at the beginning of the Christian era made a comprehensive statement regarding the sources of style which further illustrates this issue.

> First and most important is vigor of mental conception. . . . Second is strong and inspired emotion. Both of these are for the most part innate dispositions. The others are benefited also by artistic training. They are: the adequate fashioning of figures (both of speech and of thought), nobility of diction which in turn includes the choice of words and the use of figurative and artistic language; lastly, and including all the others, dignified and distinguished word arrangement.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . our first source of greatness--I mean natural high-mindedness--is the most important. It is inborn rather than acquired, but we must nevertheless educate the mind to greatness as far as possible and impregnate it, as it were, with a noble exaltation. . . . a true writer's mind can be neither humble nor ignoble. Men whose thoughts and concerns are mean and petty throughout life cannot produce anything admirable or worthy of lasting fame. The authors of great works are endowed with dignity of mind, and literary excellence belongs to those of high spirit.[1]

It would appear that while style is vitally connected with the speaker's manner of thought, in its manifested form it has to do with the choice of words and the shaping of clauses and sentences. The ancients applied the term ekloye (electio) to word choice, and sunthesis (compositio) to the structuring of clauses etc. Ancient and modern rhetoricians seem agreed on these points.

What then are the chief attributes of good style? Since the days of Theophrastus, four basic qualities have been repeatedly set forth--correctness, clearness, ornateness, and propriety. All four apply to both the choice of words and their arrangement.

---

[1]Longinus (?), On Great Writing (On the Sublime), trans. by G. M. A. Grube (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1957), 8, 9.

Let us now turn to consider the style of the Apostle Paul. Certainly there is none other that resembles it, for present in all Paul's addresses are abundant stylistic evidences of an intense individualism.

Casaubon said of this ancient missionary that he alone of writers seems to have written not with pen and ink, but with his very heart, his very feelings, and the unbared palpitations of his inmost being.[1] Jerome asserted that the words of the letters are like so many thunders, and Luther declared that Paul's expressions were both battles and like living creatures with hands and feet. Erasmus wrote that Paul "thunders and lightens and speaks sheer flame," and Norden suggested that in him the language of the heart is born again. The latter adds "How this language of the heart must have rung into the souls of men accustomed to the silly volubility of the sophists."[2]

> If he staggers under the greatness of his subject, if he is distracted by the infinity of the interests which he treats, if every word which rises to his lips suggests a host of profound and large associations, if the care of all the Churches, gives all the facts a varied but a real significance. . . . Human speech must be blamed for its poverty; human experience, which has developed speech, for its narrowness. His life was ever in his hand, his heart was on his lips. The heart was often too great for the speech.[3]
>
> What can be more free and buoyant, with all their variety, than his writings? Brilliant, broken, impetuous as the mountain torrent freshly filled, never smooth and calm but on the eve of some bold leap, never vehement but to fill some receptacle of clearest peace, they present everywhere the image of a vigorous joy. Beneath the forms of their theosophic reasonings, and their hints of deep philosophy, there may be heard a secret lyric strain

---

[1]See Farrar, St. Paul, pp. 689-690 for this and the following quotations in the original languages.

[2]T. R. Glover, Paul of Tarsus (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1930), p. 194.

[3]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 690.

> of glorious praise, bursting at times into open utterance, and asking others to join the chorus. . . . His life was a battle from which in intervals of the good fight, his words arose as the song of victory.[1]

As these last lines indicate, the cause of Paul's unique style was his unique life and character. In harmony with the truism that "style is the man" it can be said that no man has ever written like the Apostle, because no writer has ever lived as he did. Zeal, energy, faith, love, humility, and genius characterized the life of the Apostle to the Gentiles; and inevitably the imprint of all these is to be found upon his inimitable style.

> The Epistles marvellously reflect his personality. It has been said of one of the great painters that he was wont to mix his colours with blood drawn from a secret wound; and of Paul it may be said that he dipped his pen in the blood of his heart. Whatever impression had last rested on his sensitive nature coloured the flow of his thoughts and expressions, whether it was Philippian love expressed by the coming of Epaphroditus, or the story of the Corinthian division told by the members of the house of Chloe. Probably it is for this very reason, because he wrote with all the freshness of speech, with the sparkle of conversation, as though he were talking naturally in a circle of friends, that he has so moved the heart of the world.[2]

It should not be conceived that all critics are alike in their praise of Paul's style. This is not the case. It has been pointed out times without number that Paul's grammar is often faulty, that he is frequently guilty of anacolutha, that some of his sentences seem interminably long, and that others seem beyond comprehension. Charles Edward Jefferson was aware of all this when he wrote the following.

> The controversy over Paul's style is interminable, and the disheartening fact is that the Greek specialists have never been able to agree. To the present hour, it is an open question among

---

[1]Martineau, quoted by Farrar, ibid.

[2]F. B. Meyer, Paul a Servant of Jesus Christ (London: Morgan and Scott, n.d.), p. 178.

those best qualified to pass judgment, whether Paul's style is literary or not. One may says he writes like Thucydides, while another declares that he violates audaciously not only the genius of the Greek language, but the logic of human speech.

But the thing of importance to mankind about his style is not its literary qualities, but its power to carry us into the heart of the writer. In his style, we feel the heartbeat of the man. His style is rapid, it sweeps along like a prairie fire, like a swollen torrent. It has been described as 'a rapid conversation taken down by a stenographer, and reproduced without corrections! It is fortunate that no corrections were made. In his unstudied and spontaneous use of language, we get the man Paul as he was.

. . . . He was a man of action and hence had little liking for the refinements and embellishments of the rhetorical school.[1] He was a practical worker in the everyday world, and not a monk in a cell or an anchorite in a cave. . . . He was quick in his every movement, and the spirit of headlong haste is in his style. He had no time to be careful even of grammar. When grammar got in his way, he smashed it.[2]

Stalker, one of the greatest New Testament scholars, regards Paul's style in a similar way.

It cannot be maintained that Paul's Epistles are models of style. They were written far too hurriedly for this; and the last thing he thought of was to polish his periods. Often, indeed, his ideas, by the mere virtue of their fineness and beauty, run into forms of exquisite language, or there is in them such a sustained throb of emotion that they shape themselves spontaneously into sentences of noble eloquence. But oftener his language is rugged. . . .[3]

A different viewpoint, however, is the following:

Paul has repeatedly been reproached with the rudeness of his constructions, the occasional clumsiness of his sentences, his barbarous Greek generally. His critics have undoubtedly

---

[1]Jefferson probably has in mind the degenerate rhetoric of the age of the Second Sophistic.

[2]C. E. Jefferson, The Character of Paul (New York: Macmillan Company, 1923), p. 381.

[3]Stalker, p. 92.

> erred on the side of severity; for his letters bear the stamp of good literature in their essential qualities. . . . and no one can charge any letter of the apostle's with the most serious fault of dullness. Paul is always interesting and constantly uses phrases which have stood the test of time, and have become the commonplaces of all subsequent literature.[1]

Yet another point of view comes from an eminent scholar of the Greek originals.

> It is a style far too vivid, far too swayed and penetrated by personal emotion, to have admitted of being polished into conformity with the artificial standards and accuracies of the schools. . . . That many defects in it can be pointed out is certain; but then in one important point of view these defects are better than any beauties, because they are due to Paul's individuality. In whole sections of his Epistles his very want of style is his style. His style, like that of every great man, has the defects of its qualities. "Le style," said Buffon, not (as he is usually quoted) c'est l'homme, but "c'est de l'homme." He has, as every great writer has, "le style de sa pensee;" he has the style of genius, if he has not the genius of style.[2]

Because this life-long student of the writings of Paul summarizes in a superior way certain of the characteristic features of Paul's style he is quoted at length. Farrar's conclusions, unlike those of many others who write concerning the Apostle, are firsthand, springing from long and intensive study of the epistles in Greek.

> That he could when he chose wield a style of remarkable finish and eloquence without diminishing his natural intensity, is proved by the incessant assonances and balances of clauses and expressions (parechesis, parisosis, paromoiosis) in such passages as 2 Cor 6:3-11. And yet such is his noble carelessness of outward graces of style, and his complete subordination of mere elegance of expression to the purpose of expressing his exact thought, that he never shrinks, even in his grandest outbursts of rhythmic

---

[1]F. J. Foakes Jackson, The Life of Saint Paul (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926), p. 275.

[2]Farrar, St. Paul, pp. 691-692.

eloquence, from the use of a word, however colloquial, which expresses his exact shade of meaning.

All that has been written of the peculiarities of St. Paul's style may, I think, be summed up in two words--Intense Individuality. His style is himself. His natural temperament, and the circumstances under which that temperament found its daily sphere of action; his training, both Judaic and Hellenistic; his conversion and sanctification, permeating his whole life and thoughts--these united make up the Paul we know. And each of these has exercised a marked influence on his style.

1. The absorption in the one thought before him, which makes him state without any qualification truths which, taken in the whole extent of his words, seem mutually irreconcilable; the dramatic, rapid, overwhelming series of questions, which show that in his controversial passages he is always mentally face to face with an objection; the centrifugal force of mental activity, which drives him into incessant digressions and goings off at a word, due to his vivid power of realisation; the centripetal force of imagination, which keeps all these digressions under the control of one dominant thought; the grand confusions of metaphor; the vehemence which makes him love the most emphatic compounds; the irony and sarcasm; the chivalrously delicate courtesy; the overflowing sympathy with the Jew, the Pagan, the barbarian--with saint and sinner, king and slave, man and woman, young and old; the passion, which now makes his voice ring with indignation and now break with sobs; the accumulation and variation of words, from a desire to set forth the truths which he is proclaiming in every possible light; the emotional emphasis and personal references of his style; the depressed humility passing into boundless exultation;--all these are due to his natural temperament, and the atmosphere of controversy and opposition on the one hand, and deep affection on the other, in which he worked.

2. The rhetorical figures, play of words, assonances, oxymora, antitheses, of his style, . . .; the constant widening of his horizon; the traceable influence of cities, and even of personal companions, upon his vocabulary; the references to Hellenic life; the method of quoting Scripture; the Rabbinic style of exegesis, . . .--these are due to his training at Tarsus and Jerusalem, his life at Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome.

3. The daring faith which never dreads a difficulty; the unsolved antinomies, which, though unsolved, do not trouble him; "the bold soaring dialectics with which he rises from the forms of one finite and earthly thought to the infinite and spiritual life embodied in them;" the "language of ecstacy," which was to him,

> as he meant it to be to his converts, the language of the work-day world; that "transcendental-absurd" as it seems to the world, which was the very life both of his conscience and intellect, and made him what he was; the way in which, as with one powerful sweep of the wing, he passes from the pettiest earthly contentions to the spiritual and the infinite; the "shrinking infirmity and self-contempt, hidden in a sort of aureole of revelation, abundant beyond measure"--this was due to the fact that his citizenship was in heaven, his life hid with Christ in God.[1]

Paul's mastery of language is commended by this writer (Farrar) and other, though not all, scholars of the Greek New Testament concur. A typical statement from one such is the following.

> That . . . he had at command no small part of the treasuries of the Greek language, is evident from his great variety of particles; his significant variation of prepositions, which he knows how to employ so as to be a true means of conveying thought; his copious use of synonyms; his great variety of expressions for one and the same object; his employment of rare words, and partly of words coined by himself; his rich participial constructions, but especially his copious fulness of paronomasia in all its forms; the antanchlasis, parachesis, annominatio. Without directing the mind expressly to this subject, one cannot imagine how frequently the apostle uses the paronomasia. For managing the figure in a free and spirited way, however, anunembarrasseduse of the language is indispensable.[2]

From Paul's own day to the present time, his style has been responsible for much interested comment. To balance the comparatively modern expressions already given, we would notice a few statements that were made prior to the end of the fifth century.

> The first judgment, that is known to us, concerning the character of the style of Paul, was contained in the lost work of Irenaeus, On the Pauline Inversions, where with entire correctness he pronounced the ground of them to be, "the rapidity of his speech and the vehemence of his spirit."[3]

---

[1]Farrar, St. Paul, pp. 692-693.

[2]A. Tholuck, Remarks on the Life, Character, and Style of the Apostle Paul (Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1840), p. 24.

[3]Ibid., p. 32.

> Dionysius Longinus thus speaks of the eloquence of Paul; "The following men are the boast of all eloquence, and of Grecian genius, viz. Demosthenes, Lysias, Aeschines, Hyperides, Isaeus, Anarchus, or Demosthenes Crithinus, Isocrates, and Antiphon, to whom may be added Paul of Tarsus, who was the first within my knowledge, that did not make use of demonstration," who made use of persuasion and pathos rather than argument.[1]

In the fourth book of Christian Instruction, Augustine has much to say concerning the style of Paul. He cites Galatians 4:21-26 and 3:15-22 as examples of the plain style; 1 Timothy 5:1 f, Romans 12:1, 6-16, 13:6-8, 12-14 for the moderate style; and 2 Corinthians 6:2-11, Galatians 4:10-20 as expressions of the grand style. Other passages also from the epistles are discussed by Augustine as illustrations of eloquence. For example, commenting on 2 Corinthians 11:16-30, he says:

> . . . how wisely and how eloquently he speaks! He is the companion of wisdom and the leader of eloquence. The former he follows; for the latter, he leads the way, not spurning it, however, when it chooses to follow him. . . . Attentive souls can see how much wisdom is in these words. Even one who is deep in sleep can observe also with what a noble flow of eloquence they rush on.[2]

Let us now consider certain characteristics of Paul's style which are repeatedly mentioned by commentators on the epistles. They include the following:

1. The use of Koiné rather than of classical Greek.

2. Economy and profundity of expression, with frequent

---

[1]Ibid. p. 39. This statement is cited to indicate the influence of Paul's eloquence rather than to endorse its concluding affirmation. As can be seen by reference to the analysis of Galatians, logical argument is a strong feature of the Apostle's discourses.

[2]Augustine. Christian Instruction, trans. by John G. Gavigan, Vol. IV of The Fathers of the Church. Edited by Ludwig Schopp et al., 72 vols. (New York: Lima Publishing Company, Inc., 1947), p. 178.

concise epitomies.

3. Intensity of expression, revelatory of ardour and power.
4. Eloquent climaxes achieved through the Grand style.
5. Occasional ellipses, digressions, and obscurities.
6. Courtesy, intimacy, affection, and authority.
7. Frequent dialectical approach.
8. Liberal use of Tropes and Figures.
9. Copious vocabularly and richness of expression.
10. An overall approach towards language which was in strong contrast to that shown by contemporary stylists of the Second Sophistic.

We would now proceed to give examples from the epistles of these characteristics. Such examples will be typical rather than exhaustive.

1. The Use of Koiné Rather Than of Classical Greek

The Apostle aspired after intelligibility in preference to classic purity. Perhaps it was for this reason that he did not endeavor to copy the learned Greek authors in their use of the Attic dialect. Instead he chose to use the simpler vernacular form which is called the Koiné, or "common" dialect. One example of the difference may be perceived in such passages as 1 Cor. 7:29; 9:18 where the use of hina clauses reveals a much wider significance than merely the Classical purpose clause. The Greek of the New Testament is identical with that on recently discovered papyri of the first century, even though the bulk of the latter deals with such prosaic matters as buying, selling, and travelling.

2. Economy and Profundity of Expression, with Frequent Concise Epitomies.

A reader or listener has at each moment but a limited amount of mental power available. To recognise and interpret the symbols

> presented to him requires part of this power; to arrange and combine the images suggested requires a further part; and only that part which remains can be used for the realization of the thought conveyed. Hence, the more time and attention it takes to receive and understand each sentence, the less time and attention can be given to the contained idea; and the less vividly will that idea be conceived.[1]

In these words Herbert Spencer set forth that principle of style which can be called the principle of economy of effort. Because Paul was by nature a clear thinker, he never permitted words or phrases that were "hazy" in meaning to clutter the revelation of key thoughts,[2] and thus he fulfilled the law suggested above despite his occasional expression of an apparently involved thought. Consider for example the simple ensuing description of epochal events.

> . . . since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep. For this we declare to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command, with the archangel's call, and with the sound of the trumpet of God, And the dead in Christ will rise first; then we who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so we shall always be with the Lord. 1 Thess 4:14-18 RSV

Readily recognizable in this, as in other Pauline passages, are the characteristics of correctness and perspicuity. The Greek words employed are those which were readily understood by even the children of that day. It is also evident that Paul here and elsewhere used apparently simple words as the elements of profound expressions. For example, how much was meant to the early Christians by the reference

---

[1]Cited in Thonssen's Selected Readings, p. 303.

[2]It is true, however, that anacolutha can be found in the composition of some of the Apostle's subsidiary ideas.

to "the dead in Christ"! Hence, while even the children knew the meaning of each word in this instance, not even the adults could plumb all that was comprehended by this expression. In another passage on the same subject we find a similar example of simplicity and profundity united. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor:15:22. Theologians have written innumerable volumes in their attempts to depth the meaning of this sentence. It comprehends within itself a large number of the basic doctrines of the Christian faith, such as Original Sin, the Atonement, the Second Advent, the Resurrection, and Immortality.

As has been already mentioned, we owe to the Apostle hundreds of ideas never mentioned before. Christian creeds and religious literature reflect in profuse variety the seminal thoughts of Paul. Such beliefs as the resurrection of the dead, the end of the age at the return of Christ, the duties of universal Christian love, and conformity to the divinely ordained civil power within its sphere, as well as an unprecedented emphasis upon Jewish ethics are due in large part to the instrumentality of Paul.

Consider the impact of the concise but comprehensive expression "the just shall live by faith" (Gal 3:11). It became the trumpet call of the early church whereby literally millions were encouraged to forsake ritualistic observances for mystical union with Christ. Through the centuries it found periodic re-emphasis until the days of Martin Luther, when it became the watch-word of Protestantism. European and American culture would have been vastly different but for these words. Consider also the myriads of messages, spoken and written, which have endeavoured to plumb some slight passage from the epistles. The themes of 1 Corinthians 13 and 15 are echoed daily around the world, while a multitude of other passages are used to sanctify for many

believers almost every aspect and event of life. Contributing in large measure to the influence of such Pauline concepts is their concise but profound verbal expression.

Because Paul had the rare gift of being able to condense much thought into a single sentence his epistles have proved a gold-mine of preaching texts. Typical of such sentences are the following:

> . . . the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. 2 Cor 3:6

> For Jews demand signs and Greeks seek wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling-block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. 1 Cor 1:22-24 RSV

> Do not be deceived; God is not mocked, for whatever a man sows, that he will also reap. Gal 6:7 RSV

Concise, but comprehensive, passages could be multiplied by way of example. The best-known is the following:

> Love is patient and kind; love is not jealous or boastful; it is not arrogant or rude. Love does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice at wrong, but rejoices in the right. Love bears all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Love never ends. . . . 1 Cor 13:4-8 RSV

Another passage, almost as well known, is Galatians 5:22-24

> But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control; against such there is no law. And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires. RSV

3. Intensity of Expression

One needs no rhetorical training to mark this characteristic of Paul's writing. Ardour and power stamp each of his messages.

> He was filled with the conviction of a message of which he was the vehicle; and thenceforth he spoke under a compelling power as great as that felt by the prophets--a compelling power to which he surrendered himself willingly and to the uttermost. . . . this conviction of the worth of his message is the first

secret of his convincing oratory, and it carries with it as a corollary a sense of responsibility and an intense earnestness. St. Paul's mission is to convince.[1]

Let us notice some examples.

1 Cor 9:16 RSV

For if I preach the gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!

vs 19, 22, 23

For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more. . . . I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. I do it all for the sake of the gospel. . . .

vs 26, 27

. . . I do not run aimlessly, I do not box as one beating the air; but I pommel my body and subdue it, lest after preaching to others I myself should be disqualified.

Galatians 1:6-12

I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ and turning to a different gospel--not that there is another gospel, but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, If any one is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be accursed.

Am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I trying to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ.

For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ.

Glatians 3:1-4 RSV

O foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified? Let me

---

[1]Kathleen E. Innes, The Bible as Literature (London: J. Cape, 1930), pp. 223-224.

ask you only this: Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by hearing with faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun with the Spirit, are you now ending with the flesh? Did you experience so many things in vain?--if it really is in vain.

4:11-19
I am afraid I have labored over you in vain.

Brethren, I beseech you, become as I am, for I also have become as you are. You did me no wrong; you know it was because of a bodily ailment that I preached the gospel to you at first; and though my condition was a trial to you, you did not scorn or despise me, but received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus. What has become of the satisfaction you felt? For I bear you witness that, if possible, you would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me. Have I then become your enemy by telling you the truth? They make much of you, but for no good purpose; they want to shut you out, that you may make much of them. For a good purpose it is always good to be made much of, and not only when I am present with you. My little children, with whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you!

6:14, 15
But far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world. For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation.

Philippians 1:20-26
. . . as it is my eager expectation and hope that I shall not be at all ashamed, but that with full courage now as always Christ will be honored in my body, whether by life or by death. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. If it is to be life in the flesh, that means fruitful labor for me. Yet which I shall choose I cannot tell. I am hard pressed between the two. My desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better. But to remain in the flesh is more necessary on your account. Convinced of this, I know that I shall remain and continue with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith, so that in me you may have ample cause to glory in Christ Jesus, because of my coming to you again.

4. Eloquent Climaxes Achieved Through the Grand Style

Two of the best examples of this characteristic are found in Chapters 13 and 15 of 1 Corinthians. The hymn to love occurs after Paul has gently rebuked vain and quarrelling schismatics in the church. The second instance is the climax to Paul's argument regarding the certainty of the resurrection of the body.

1 Cor 15:51-55 RSV

> Lo! I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed. For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality. When the perishable puts on the imperishable, and the mortal puts on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written:
>
> "Death is swallowed up in victory."
> "O death, where is thy victory?"
> "O death, where is thy sting?"

Yet another instance is the description of the Christian ministry which appears as the culmination of Paul's argument regarding the nature and privileges of the leaders in the early church.

2 Cor 6:3-10 RSV

> We put no obstacle in any one's way, so that no fault may be found with our ministry, but as servants of God we commend ourselves in every way; through great endurance, in afflictions, hardships, calamities, beatings, imprisonments, tumults, labors, watching, hunger, by purity, knowledge, forbearance, kindness, the Holy Spirit, genuine love, truthful speech, and the power of God; with the weapons of righteousness for the right hand and for the left; in honor and dishonor, in ill repute and good repute. We are treated as impostors, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as punished, and yet not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing everything.

Paul's biographical résumés in 2 Cor 11:22-28 and Philippians 3:4-11 are conspicuous among the many other eloquent climaxes which could be cited.

5. Occasional Ellipses, Digressions, and Obscurities

Gal 2:3,4 is an instance of all three characteristics named above. Paul has been discussing his career subsequent to conversion; and upon reference to his journey to Jerusalem, he digresses by referring to a particular experience there which concerned Titus his associate.

> But even Titus, who was with me, was not compelled to be circumcised, though he was a Greek. But because of false brethren secretly brought in, who slipped in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage--. . . RSV

The dash in the Revised Standard Version is inserted because the sentence begun in verse four does not seem to be completed. Paul apparently rushes on with other matters as memories come tumbling in upon him. Because of this, it is difficult to be certain of his exact meaning in this passage, and the RSV and the KJV present alternative views.

Other instances of digression have been pointed out in the analyses of the development of thought.

Concerning the obscurities of Paul it should be remembered that often what is considered to be such may be only the result of the archaic wording of the KJV, or the gap in our understanding of the ancient milieu caused by the intervention of nineteen centuries. In other cases Paul is to blame when his teeming brain outdistanced the pen of his amanuensis.

6. Courtesy, Intimacy, Affection, and Authority

While the best example of Paul's use of emphatic, directive expressions, implicative of authority is to be found in the first and last chapters of Galatians, Philemon is outstanding for its revelation of the Apostle's courtesy, intimacy, and affection. We would include

the attribute of tact also under courtesy. The two following quotations are pertinent not only because they delineate Paul's manifestation of these characteristics, but because they afford a comprehensive view of the style of the only personal letter we have from the Apostle. (The other epistles were addressed to large churches, but while this epistle was read to the company of believers that met in Philemon's house its message was primarily for the slave-owner himself.)

> The aim of the letter is pursued with so much Christian love and wisdom, with so great psychological tact, and, without sacrifice of the apostolic authority, in a manner so thoughtfully condescending, adroit, delicate, and irresistible that the brief letter--which is in the finest sense "seasoned with salt" as a most precious and characteristic revelation of the great apostle--belongs, even as regards its Attic refinement and gracefulness, to the epistolatory masterpieces of antiquity.[1]

> The Epistle to Philemon has one peculiar feature--its aesthetical character it may be termed--which distinguishes it from all other epistles, and demands a special notice at our hands. It has been admired deservedly as a model of delicacy and skill in the department of composition to which it belongs. The writer had peculiar difficulties to overcome. He was the common friend of the parties at variance. He must conciliate a man who supposed that he had good reason to be offended. He must commend the offender, and yet neither deny nor aggravate the imputed fault. He must assert the new ideas of Christian equality in the face of a system which hardly recognized the humanity of the enslaved. He could have placed the question on the ground of his own personal rights, and yet must waive them in order to secure an act of spontaneous kindness. His success must be a triumph of love, and nothing be demanded for the sake of the justice which could have claimed everything. He limits his request to a forgiveness of the alleged wrong, and a restoration to favor and the enjoyment of future sympathy and affection, and yet would so guard his words as to leave scope for all the generosity which benevolence might prompt toward one whose condition admitted of so much alleviation. These are contrarieties not easy to harmonize; but Paul, it is confessed, has shown a

---

[1]Meyer, cited by George Barlow (ed.) Preacher's Homiletic Commentary (London: Funk and Wagnalls Co., n.d.), pp. 105-106.

> degree of self denial and a tact in dealing with them, which in being equal to the occasion could hardly be greater.[1]

Also typical of the Apostle's intimacy and affection are such passages from the other letters as Phil 3:1,; 4:1; 2 Thess 1:7; 1 Thess 2:5-8; and 2 Cor 6:11. His endearing appellativesinclude "Brethren" (1 Cor 1:10; 14:20, 26; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 3:15; 6:18 etc.), "my beloved" Phil 2:12; "Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, and fellowsoldier" Phil 2:25. Other appeals to the feelings of his audience are found in the sympathetic expressions of 2 Cor 2:4; 1:3-6; 1:7; 2:3; 5:1-4 7:2, 3; Phil 2:28; 2 Thess 2:16. Respectively, these seek the responses of affection, comfort, hopefulness, joyfulness, expectancy, cordiality, joy, hopefulness, and comfort. Thus Paul's selection of words with emotional impact greatly adds to the quality and strength of his pathetic proof.

7. Frequent Dialectical Approach

Chapters two to four of Galatians; 1 Corinthians nine, fourteen, and fifteen, and 2 Corinthians eight and nine afford representative instances of this feature of Paul's style. Affirmed John Locke:

> I think that there is not anywhere to be found a more pertinent, close arguer who has his eye always on the mark he drives at. . . . I do not say that he is everywhere clear in his expression to us now, but I do say that he is everywhere a coherent, pertinent writer.[2]

8. Liberal Use of Tropes and Figures

The next few pages illustrate with some scores of examples the bountiful use of imagery found in these discourses. One striking lack,

---

[1]H. B. Hackett, (ed.), Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1881), p. 2485.

[2]Cited by Francis Peabody, The Apostle Paul and the Modern World, pp. 75-76.

however, in the Apostle's otherwise abundant repertoire of tropes and figures is the paucity of allusions to nature. ". . . the reference to nature in St. Paul's writings are almost entirely to nature in connection with human labor; not to its beauty . . . but to its useful and beneficient processes under the work of cultivation."[1]

Examples of Paul's allusions to nature as regards its productive operations are found in 1 Corinthians 15:35-38; 15:42-44; 15:20, 23; 9:7-10; Galatians 6:7, 8; 2 Cor 9:6-9; 9:10, 11; A reason for this anomaly has been suggested.

> . . . his soul was so entirely absorbed in the mighty moral and spiritual truths which it was his great mission to proclaim, that not by one verse, scarcely even by a single expression, in all his letters, does he indicate the faintest gleam of delight or wonder in the glories of Nature. . . . There are souls in which the burning heat of some transforming purpose calcines every other thought, every other desire, every other admiration; and St Paul's was one. His life was absorbingly, if not solely and exclusively, the spiritual life--the life which is utterly dead to every other interest of the groaning and travailing creation, the life hid with Christ in God. He sees the universe of God only as it is reflected in the heart and life of man.[2]

Metaphor

The Apostle has four favorite metaphors each of which may have originated from his early experiences in Tarsus, the city of his birth. These metaphors are related to Roman soldiery, classical architecture, agriculture, and the Greek games. Reference has been made to the allusions to agriculture, but the three other major metaphors are to be found in the following texts.

---

[1]John S. Howson, The Metaphors of St. Paul and Companions of St. Paul, (American Tract Society, 1871), p. 48.

[2]Farrar, St. Paul, p. 11.

Architecture: Gal 2:18; 1 Cor 8:1, 10; 2 Cor 12:19; 6:16; 1 Cor 6:19; 10:23; 14:3-5, 12, 17; 3:9; 2 Cor 5:1; Gal 2:9.

Military: 1 Thess 5:5-8; 2 Cor 2:14-16; 10:3-6; 7:5; 1 Cor 15:23, 52; 14:8.

Greek Games: 2 Thess 3:1; Gal 2:2; 5:7; Phil 2:16; 3:12-14; 1 Thess 2:2; 1 Cor 9:24-27.

Metonymy

Metonymy is employed in 1 Cor 10:21, and Gal 2:7.

Personification

Personification is found in 1 Cor 15:55, Gal 3:8, 22 and in at least one other Scripture. The first-mentioned is the most well-known. "O death where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?"

Simile

There are eight similes in 1 Thessalonians, four in 2 Thessalonians, twenty-six in 1 Corinthians, twenty-three in 2 Corinthians, eight in Galatians, five in Philippians, and three in Philemon.

Paradox and Oxymoron

Paul has a definite penchant for paradoxes. That he delights in them is apparent from 2 Cor 12:10; 1 Cor 3:9; 8:10; 2 Cor 4:8-10; 6:9, 8:2; 1 Thess 4:11; 1:6. A typical instance is: "When I am weak, then am I strong." 2 Cor 12:10.

Euphemism

See 1 Cor 5:1, 2; 2 Cor 7:11; 1 Thess 4:6.

Irony

2 Cor 11:7 "Did I commit a sin in abasing myself so that you might be exalted, because I preached God's gospel without cost to you? RSV

2 Cor 12:13 For in what were you less favored than the rest of the churches, except that I myself did not burden you? Forgive me this wrong! RSV

Hyperbole

There is little hyperbole in the Paulines, but the figure is found in 2 Cor 2:14; Rom 16:19; 1 Thess 1:8.

Paronomasia

This figure in the form where it is dependent upon a play of words of similar sound or origin is Paul's most used rhetorical figure. Only the Greek original reveals its prevalence, and therefore some examples from the Koiné are given.

2 Cor 3:2 ginoskomene kai anaginoskomene

Phil 3:2, 3 katatome . . . peritome

1 Cor 11:29-31 diakrisis . . . krima . . . katakrima

1 Cor 7:31 chomenoi . . . katachromenoi

2 Cor 6:10 echontes . . . katechontes

2 Cor 4:8 aporoumenoi . . . exaporoumenoi

Paronomasia of another class consists of plays on names. For example,

Philemon 11, Onesimon . . . achreston

Philemon 20 Nai, eyo sou onaimen

In the first of these instances, Paul plays upon the meaning of the slave's name of Onesimus. The word means "profitable," and Paul links with the name a synonym for this characteristic. In the second instance, Paul uses again the former of these words in its usual form when not employed as a proper noun.[1]

---

[1]See Farrar, St. Paul, pp. 693-696 for a more complete list of figures.

Copious Vocabulary and Richness of Expression

> It has been said that the variety of adjectives he has at his command is the test of a man's culture. St. Paul would come well out of this test, and his adjectives are not mere repetition. Each adds some shade of meaning that is necessary: 'The King is eternal, immortal, invisible.' The servant of the Lord should be 'gentle, apt to teach, patient.' Nouns and phrases used in a qualifying or descriptive sense are added one to another in the same way.[1]
>
> But St. Paul is no waster of words. Not one of all these nouns and adjectives could be removed without doing injury to the meaning. Where the meaning requires it he can, as has been already illustrated, write with dignified simplicity, and he does so particularly when he is uttering profound truths with a practical application to life. His style is responsive to the purpose for which the particular passage is designed. To persuade, he makes use of a wide variety of illustrations and comparisons, and there is an avoidance of monotony. Sometimes there are flowing and sonorous passages; at other times simple and dignified statement. St. Paul is master of his instrument.[2]

Another writer makes the following claim:

> Certainly no more expert and splendid dialectical energy than that of Paul is known to have wrought in even the abundant and delicate Greek tongue.[3]

10. An Overall Approach Towards Language Which Was in Strong Contrast to that Shown by Contemporary Stylists of the Second Sophistic

It is noteworthy that Paul, with regard to style, was not a child of his age. In the chapter on the Second Sophistic the rhetorical characteristics of Paul's day were delineated. It was an age that cared for form rather than substance, that delighted in exhibition and virtuosity. The significant ideas expressed in oratory were few, but

---

[1]Innes, p. 236.

[2]Ibid., p. 238.

[3]Storrs, Divine Origin of Christianity, p. 225, cited by Kuist, pp. 105-106.

frills and techniques were multitudinous. Rhetoric "had degenerated into 'inflated, extravagant word-spinning,' completely removed from the world of reality."[1]

Those who find fault with the oratory of Paul in our own generation do so on the grounds thatattimes he went to the opposite extreme from that of typical speakers in the Second Sophistic. He was vitally concerned with matter rather than manner; and although capable of impressive eloquence, the Apostle sometimes sacrificed this for what he considered to be a more important end. Augustine points out, for example, how the Apostle's rhythm of phrasing could have been improved with a little care.[2] He also makes a remark concerning Paul's style which is reminiscent of Campbell's concept that "the means by which the orator shall accomplish his purpose must differ according to the nature of the effect desired."[3] Says Augustine:

> A certain kind of eloquence is more fitting for youth, and another is more becoming for old age; so much so that we should not call it eloquence if it is not appropriate for the person of the speaker. There is a kind of eloquence, then, which is becoming for men eminently worthy of the highest authority and manifestly inspired by God. Biblical writers have spoken with this kind of eloquence; no other kind becomes them, nor is that kind suitable for other writers. It is appropriate for them, and the more humble it seems to be, the higher it rises above others, not because of its conceit, but because of its solidity.[4]

This Church Father, who prior to his conversion had been a professional teacher of rhetoric, apparently believed that because the purpose of writers of Scripture such as Paul was to work reformation

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 99.

[2]Augustine, p. 209.

[3]Thonssen and Baird, p. 135

[4]Augustine, pp. 175-176.

of life rather than impress by virtuosity, therefore some apparent shortcomings in style should be expected. Examples are to be found in such passages as 1 Corinthians 11, Galatians 2 etc., where the obvious purpose is to clarify Christian duty rather than to provide verbal delights. Nevertheless, even in these passages there is evidence of stylistic excellency perceived as such when we recall that ornateness is but a minor quality of style, ever to be held subsidiary to clearness and correctness.

With these preceding characteristics of Paul's style in mind, we would consider the prevailing concept and criteria of style which is offered in summary by two representative speech critics.

> . . . style is neither a mysterious embellishment added to a speech nor a literary veneer superimposed upon it. Indeed, it represents the way in which a language pattern is used, under a given set of conditions, (1) to make ideas acceptable and (2) to get the response sought by the speaker. Style becomes the instrumentality through which ideas are made meaningful; it clothes the reason and emotion of the speaker in such words as will have intelligibility value for the hearers. . . . The essential components of a speaker's style are aspects of the communicative act. An effective style--that is, one capable of preparing and opening the minds of the listeners for a particular subject--depends upon a speaker's having (1) an idea worth presenting, (2) an unmistakably clear conception of the idea, (3) a desire to communicate it, (4) a willingness to adapt it to a particular set of circumstances, and (5) a mastery of language adequate to express the idea in words.[1]

This study suggests that nine of the ten characteristics of Paul's style which have been mentioned comply with the criteria here laid down. Paul's ellipses, digressions, and obscurities remain a blemish, despite the fact that we can easily account for them, (see page 423). It should be stressed again that much of the modern difficulty in

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 430.

comprehending some passages of Paul is due more to our separation in time from his day, and the archaic rendering of the Bible version most employed (KJV), rather than to his deficiencies as a stylist.

CHAPTER VII

PAULINE ETHOS COMPARED WITH THE ETHOS OF LATE AMERICAN PREACHING THEORY

As noted in the Introduction, one of the objectives of the present study is to compare Pauline ethos with the ethos described in recent American preaching theory. We now propose to do this.

For the purposes of his dissertation "Concept of Ethos in Late American Preaching," John J. Rudin II studied over two hundred books setting forth the recommendations of recent American homileticians.[1] He was, as has been suggested, particularly interested in the role ascribed to ethos although this term itself was rarely used by the writers on preaching.[2]

Not only did Rudin find that the concept of ethos in preaching theory had strong contrasts to, as well as some similarities with, the classical rhetorical concept, but it became apparent that these divergencies originated in the distinctive premises of preaching, premises which set this branch of rhetoric in a separate category from secular oratory. Typical references given by Rudin are the following.

---

[1]These volumes were written by Protestants between the years 1870 and 1950.

[2]Rudin declares that the "definition by Aristotle is broadened and paraphrased for purposes of investigation to 'the effect upon the listener of the speaker's person, whether before or during the speech-situation'" "Concept of Ethos in Late American Preaching" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Speech, North-Western University), p. 10. See Appendix for Rudin's summary of his conclusions.

> The preacher is a public speaker like the lecturer and the orator. Like them he must regard the laws of rhetoric and elocution. Like them he must study the workings of the mind and the special conditions of the associate mind of the crowd. . . .[1]

Rudin now draws attention to the following qualification made by the writer of this statement.

> A man must speak the message, a man who knows and feels its power, a man throbbing with its spirit and import. And here preaching, though using all the natural powers and arts of speech, is lifted distinctly above rhetoric and elocution, into a higher plane of spiritual influence. It is the power of personal testimony, the Christ speaking through his messengers. "Ye are my witnesses."[2]

> Preaching is quite different than oratory. The pulpit is another place than the platform. . . . The Christian preacher is the successor, not of the Greek orator, but of the Hebrew prophet. The orator comes but with an inspiration, the prophet comes with a revelation. Insofar as the preacher and the prophet had an analogue in Greece, it was the dramatist, with his urgent sense of life's guilty tragedy, its inevitable ethic, its unseen moral powers, and their atoning and purifying note. . . .
>
> Moreover, where you have the passion for oratory, you are not unlikely to have an impaired style and standard of preaching. For if your object is to secure your audience, rather than your gospel, preaching is sure to suffer. . . . It is one thing to have to arouse or persuade people to do something, put themselves into something; it is another to have to induce them to trust somebody and renounce themselves for him. The one is the political region of work, the other is the religious region of faith. . . . The orator stirs men to rally, the preacher invites them to be redeemed. . . . The orator, at most, may urge men to love their brother, the preacher beseeches them first to be reconciled to their Father. With preaching Christianity stands or falls because it is the declaration of a gospel. Nay more--far more--it is the gospel prolonging and declaring itself.[3]

---

[1]Arthur F. Hoyt, The Work of Preaching, cited by Rudin, p. 24.

[2]Ibid., p. 16.

[3]P. T. Forsyth, Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), pp. 3-5, cited by Rudin pp. 39-40.

In the closing chapter of Rudin's dissertation a summary is made regarding the distinctive characteristics of preaching as viewed by the preaching theorists.

> Preaching receives "its own peculiar character as distinct from all others", in the opinion of the writers, because it is prophetic utterance, because the preacher is a called and commissioned messenger of God, invested with authority, who proclaims a Word not his own. "The preacher is a channel, not a source."
>
> In the light of this basic premise, the foregoing characteristics of the literature are seen to be aspects of a distinctive Godward orientation and a unique message-consciousness which distinguish preaching from Aristotelian rhetoric.[1]

Such unique premises naturally result in differences of method which are recognized as such when aligned with classical rhetoric. For example, preaching makes much of inartistic proofs whereas the stress of Aristotle was upon the artistic. "The 'given' nature of the Gospel, Bible, Word, and message favor inartistic proofs, already existing, ready for use by the speaker, revealed to him. This discourages a method-emphasis."[2] Closely allied to, and probably responsible for this difference is the fact that while secular rhetoric does not deal with absolute or final truth, preaching claims to do that very thing. Similarly, secular rhetoric makes no claim regarding "absolute authority, and is limited to the realm of probabilities,"[3] while preaching asserts that its "source and ground of authority is God, who supplies the message,"[4] a message which by virtue of its origin expresses absolutes with complete confidence.

---

[1]Rudin, pp. 464-465.

[2]Ibid., p. 467.

[3]Ibid., p. 466.

[4]Ibid., p. 467.

Almost as significant is the different emphasis upon audience-adaptation. A comprehensive statement by Rudin synthesizes the contrast between religious and secular oratory in this respect.

> Both Aristotelian rhetoric and preaching reflect the influence of the social setting. Aristotelian rhetoric, lacking the ultimate authority of a Bible and a sense of divine commission, and therefore viewing the audience as "judge", is rhetoric of method, the primary goal of which is persuasion, with adaptation of arguments the chief means of effectuating logical, ethical, and pathetic proof. The speaker's ultimate authority rests in his ability to persuade the audience by means of these modes of proof, and such a rhetoric must emphasize as a major motif the adaptation of arguments to the audience.
>
> Christian preaching, on the other hand, is conditioned by its religious premises, which are rooted in the Old Testament. Viewing the preacher as a successor to the Hebrew prophet, as a messenger with a divinely-given message, as a witness, as a "servant of the Word", the writers emphasize the speaker's relation to his subject as primary, and his relation to the audience becomes a secondary concern.
>
> As a consequence, they view the speaker's personal qualities primarily in relation to God, and only secondarily in relation to their effect upon the hearer.
>
> Likewise, this subject-and message-orientation leads the writers to distrust adaptation to the preferences of the listener, as a threat to the objective truth of the message and the faithfulness of the messenger, and they relegate the audience and audience-adaptation to a role of minor importance.
>
> Impelled also by their view of preaching as ministry, they emphasize the preacher's role as a minister to human needs, and thus they advocate analysis and adaptation in the interests of effective ministry, rather than in the interests of the evincing of ethos.
>
> In this characteristic lack of interest in adaptation as a means of evincing ethos, and in their emphasis upon ministry to human needs, the writers on preaching differ basically from the method-emphasis of Aristotle, in which adaptation to the audience is a primary requisite for the evincing of ethos.
>
> Aristotle developed a rhetoric of topoi, of dianonia, and of adaptation; in Christian preaching, adaptation is a minor canon.[1]

---

[1]Rudin, pp. 392-393.

It should be noticed that this statement does not declare that audience-adaptation plays no part in the work of the preacher. It says, rather, that this adaptation occupies a secondary rather than a primary place, and also that analysis and adaptation have as their purpose the benefiting of the audience in a spiritual way rather than the making manifest of the speaker's ethos.

The above quotation suggests the inevitable modification of the Aristotelian concept of ethos made by preaching theorists. In essence, while Aristotle required the evincing of virtue, competence, and good will, homiletics demands the actual possession of these qualities. The preacher's reflection of the attributes of ethos is not to be a calculated affair. Rather it is the unconscious revelation of the transformed character of "a man in Christ" speaking Heaven's message with authority. Thus while for Aristotle, ethos is manifested through thought revealed in argument, for the preacher it is the inevitable display of "truth through personality."

The man who claims to be Heaven's messenger is not to view the virtues as merely topoi for arguments evincing persuasive ethos. Instead he is to view such qualities as ones which he is obliged to possess. They must never be simulated by him. Thus the preacher's authority (which is a cognate of the classical ethos) is not to be viewed as a cloak for his own inadequacies. The following statement suggests in summary form the homiletic concept of ethos derived from recent American preaching theory.

> While a number of writers recognize the importance of the speaker-hearer relationship, the conceptions of "message" and "ambassadorship" lead them to view the role of the speaker as announcer of a communication from a higher authority, the messenger thereby requiring and acquiring "authority". This "authority" is viewed as originating in the preacher's relationship to God, Christ, the Bible, the church, and his ministerial office. These are insufficient, but personal religious experience

> augments his authority. Finally, his personal qualifications of piety, competence, veracity and delivery further enhance his authority.[1]

Preaching thus becomes "both an art and an incarnation."[2]

At this juncture it is our purpose to compare the practice of Paul at the beginning of the era of Christian preaching with the modern concepts of homiletics discussed above. Is there some correlation between these, or have Paul's descendants evolved basic viewpoints which stand in contrast to the matter and methods exemplified by the Apostle? If the former is found to be the case, was Paul at least partly responsible for the significant emphases of homileticians of our day?

We have already noticed in the analyses of the epistles that ethical proof occupies a conspicuous place in Pauline oratory, and we have also discovered that such proof is capable of evaluation according to the classical criteria. Now we would inquire whether the Apostle's ethos shares, in addition, the extra qualities suggested by recent preaching theory, and whether basically it partakes of the same nature as the suggested ideal in this regard. In view of these aims, the following questions are appropriate as we reconsider the personal proof contained in the Pauline discourses:

1. Does the claim of being an ambassador for God occupy a prominent place in the ethical arguments of the Apostle?
2. Did Paul profess to be the bearer of a divine revelation?
3. Did he place more emphasis upon his personal authority than upon his other characteristics?
4. Did the Apostle consider himself pre-eminently as a witness for Christ rather than as an advocate?

---

[1]Rudin, pp. 75-76.

[2]Ibid., p. 478.

5. Was extensive use made by Paul of inartistic proofs such as the Old Testament Scriptures, and were these given more weight than the artistic proofs of his own devising?
6. As the indications of Paul's adaptation to his audiences are reviewed, do we find evidence that such adaptation was secondary to the major purpose of conveying an authoritative and unchanging message? Or, on the other hand, do we find that audience adaptation was a method for primarily manifesting personal proof?
7. Does the evidence point beyond the profession of virtue by Paul to his actual possession of the primary ethical qualities?
8. Do the Pauline discourses comply with the modern homiletic dictum that preaching should be "both an art and an incarnation"?

We would answer the first four questions by representative passages from each of the addresses under study. Each of the following references has a readily perceived bearing upon at least one of these questions which are considered as a group because of their natural affinity.

1 Thessalonians

> . . . just as we have been approved by God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, not to please men, but to please God who tests our hearts. For we never used either words of flattery, as you know, or a cloak for greed, as God is witness; nor did we seek glory from men, whether from you or from others, though we might have made demands as apostles of Christ. 2:4-6 RSV

> . . . for our gospel came to you not only in word, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction. You know what kind of men we proved to be among you for your sake. And you became imitators of us and of the Lord, for you received the word in much affliction, with joy inspired by the Holy Spirit. . . . 1:5,6 RSV

And we also thank God constantly for this, that when you received the word of God which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God. . . . 2:13 RSV

2 Thessalonians

. . . God chose you from the beginning to be saved, through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth. To this he called you through our gospel. . . . 2:14 RSV

Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may speed on and triumph, as it did among you. . . . 3:1 RSV

Now such persons we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . 3:12 RSV

1 Corinthians

Paul, called by the will of God to be an apostle. . . . 1:1 RSV

For Christ did not send me to baptize but to preach the gospel. . . . For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. 1:17, 18 RSV

. . . my speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power, that your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men but in the power of God. Yet among the mature we do impart wisdom, although it is not a wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age, who are doomed to pass away. But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages. . . . 2:4-7 RSV

And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit. . . . 2:13 RSV

What then is Apollos? What is Paul? Servants through whom you believed, as the Lord assigned to each. 3:5 RSV

According to the commission of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation. . . . 3:10 RSV

This is how one should regard us, as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. 4:1 RSV

Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are not you my workmanship in the Lord? 9:1 RSV

For if I preach the gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel! . . . I am entrusted with a commission. 9:16, 17 RSV

If any one thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a command of the Lord. 14:37 RSV

For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received. . . . 15:3 RSV

Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me. For I am the least of the apostles, unfit to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace toward me was not in vain. On the contrary, I worked harder than any of them, though it was not I, but the grace of God which is with me. 15:8-10 RSV

2 Corinthians

Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God. . . . 1:1 RSV

. . . you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God. . . . Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers. . . . 3:3, 5, 6 RSV

For what we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. . . . But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us. 4:5, 7 RSV

So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God. . . . Working together with him, then, we entreat you. . . . 5:20; 6:1 RSV

For even if I boast a little too much of our authority, which the Lord gave for building you up and not for destroying you, I shall not be put to shame. . . . we will not boast beyond limit, but will keep to the limits God has apportioned us. . . . 10:8, 13 RSV

. . . I will go on to visions and revelations of the Lord. I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven. . . . 12:1, 2 RSV

The signs of a true apostle were performed among you in all patience, with signs and wonders and mighty works. 12:12 RSV

I write this while I am away from you, in order that when I come I may not have to be severe in my use of the authority which the Lord has given me. . . . 2 Cor 13:10 RSV

Galatians

Paul an apostle--not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father. . . . 1:1 RSV

Am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God, Or am I trying to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ. 1:10 RSV

For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ. . . . 1:11, 12 RSV

Philippians

Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus . . . Grace to you and peace from God our Father. . . . 1:1, 2 RSV

. . . it is my eager expectation and hope that I shall not be at all ashamed, but that with full courage now as always Christ

will be honored in my body, whether by life or by death. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. 1:20, 21 RSV

. . . in every way, . . . Christ is proclaimed. . . . 1:18 RSV

But whatever gain I had, I counted as loss for the sake of Christ. Indeed, I count everything as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them as refuse, in order that I may gain Christ. . . . that I may know him and the power of his resurrection. . . . Not that I have already obtained this or am already perfect; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own. 3:7-10, 12 RSV

Philemon

Paul, a prisoner for Christ Jesus. . . . Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. vs 1, 3 RSV

Accordingly, though I am bold enough in Christ to command you to do what is required, yet for love's sake I prefer to appeal to you--I, Paul, an ambassador and now a prisoner also for Christ Jesus. . . . vs 8, 9 RSV

These are typical rather than exhaustive quotations from the seven epistles, but they suffice to answer clearly in the affirmative the first four questions proposed.

The fifth question inquired whether Paul made extensive use of inartistic proofs, and whether these were given more weight than the artistic proofs of his own devising.

The gospel message which Paul claimed to have received by revelation is both an inartistic proof and the chief burden of all his messages. With great emphasis he declares that he did not preach the gospel with the primary purpose in mind of pleasing men.[1] Furthermore,

---

[1] 1 Thess 2:4, Gal 1:10-12.

the Apostle insisted that it was the afflatus of the Holy Spirit which gave potency to his words.[1] In addition to this, an examination of Nestle's Greek New Testament, which places in heavy type the Old Testament references used by New Testament writers, discloses that Paul constantly quoted from the Old Testament as a ready-made source of evidence. Such passages are usually cited in highly strategic points in the arguments of the epistles as can be readily perceived by even a cursory reading of Galatians chapters three and four, and other sections of the letters.

Despite these facts, it should be recognized that the Apostle did practice a measure of audience adaptation. The differences in style manifested by Galatians, Corinthians, and Philemon demonstrate this. To the Galatians, Paul is sternly emphatic, but to the Corinthians, who lived in a less favorable environment, he is infinitely more tender and cautious in expression. In the personal letter to Philemon, he is even playful, and displays marvellous tact. To the open-hearted and ingenuous Philippians, Paul acts with a corresponding lack of reserve. He is never a mere amanuensis in the hand of God, for his messages evidence the full measure of his own rich personality. He is God's penman, but not God's pen, for none knew better than he that "the Torah must speak in the language of men."

Thus we find that the Apostle willingly chose to rely heavily on inartistic proofs, but he incorporated these skillfully in rhetorical settings determined by the nature of the occasion and the audience.

In question seven it was inquired whether Paul's adaptation to his audiences was secondary to his main purpose of conveying an authoritative and unchanging central message. Probably the answer to question five indicates the true situation in this instance also.

---

[1] 1 Cor 2:4-7, 13; 1 Thess 1:5, 6.

His emphasis upon a "given!" revelation insured that such should not be sacrificed by concessions to the "sorry nature of audiences." From the Apostle we have the express declaration: "If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ" Gal 1:10. This should not be understood as implying that he was unconcerned whether his messages were adapted to the particular audience. We have already seen that on each occasion he spoke as one fully conscious of the peculiarities involved in the specific situation. The important point is that Paul never emasculated the truths committed to him in order to render them more acceptable. Similarly, the adaptation practiced by him does not seem to have had as its planned purpose the manifestation of personal proof. Such manifestation appears to have been unconscious rather than premeditated.

Does the evidence point beyond the profession of virtue by Paul to his actual possession of the primary ethical qualities? It might be argued that it would be possible for someone to write as Paul did without the actual possession of "good" character, but such seems most unlikely. Firstly, it is apparent that the manifestations of ethos closely parallel the subject matter themes of each discourse. Faith, hope, love, truthfulness, honesty etc. are the themes of the Pauline messages. This is not usually the case in those instances of secular oratory which reveal considerable ethical proof. We would naturally expect that the one who was so concerned about the development of such virtues would himself possess them to a large degree. Secondly, those aspects of style which seem blemishes from a purely rhetorical standpoint find their explanation in the fact that Paul was more concerned with matter than with method. For example, the frequent digressions indicate this pre-occupation, and the sometimes lengthy and involved sentences suggest the same. Thirdly, the evidence from Acts regarding Paul's

character as seen through the eyes of another should be taken into account. This narrative written by a professional man (the "beloved physician") describes a Paul who corresponds to the Paul of the epistles. The weight of available evidence indicates that the Apostle actually possessed the virtues evinced by his ethical proof.

Finally, we ask--Do the Pauline discourses comply with the modern homiletic dictum that preaching should be "both an art and an incarnation"? The answer can be drawn from the preceding. To Paul, preaching was first and foremost an incarnation. His knowledge of life, men, and letters, however, insured that his homiletic endeavours represented even more than this. The foregoing chapters have shown that the discourses of the Apostle are capable of analysis according to the classical criteria with results that are highly creditable to Paul. On the other hand, when the work of this early preacher is viewed in the light of modern homiletic theory, it becomes evident that while these messages are certainly within the sphere of oratory they represent oratory of a specific kind. Paul's preaching was based upon the fundamental premise of his ambassadorship for God, and it was this which gave the motif for his addresses. Thus there is a striking correspondence between the Apostles's preaching practice and the practice required by recent homiletic theory. Such a close relationship calls for some explanation. To what extent has Paul been responsible for the present trend in this area?

The books on preaching cited by Rudin make extensive reference to Paul and his letters. Even some of the titles allude to the words of Paul. These include Men of the Mysteries by Ralph W. Sockman, The Ambassador by James E. Freeman, The Liberty of Prophesying by Hensley H. Henson, Sufficient Ministers by Joseph M. Gray, We Prophesy in Part by Willard L. Sperry, and others. This use made

of Paul in the titles of volumes on preaching rightly represents the emphasis given to Pauline concepts and practice in modern homiletics. To indicate that this emphasis is not new, we would introduce an important witness from the fifth century.

Probably the most influential figure in the Christian church since the time of Paul was St. Augustine. Modern homileticians, whose Seminary training usually includes emphases upon Augustinian thought, reflect the stamp of this former teacher of rhetoric who was also the greatest of the Fathers of the Church. Because much of his material in book four of Christian Instruction is highly pertinent to our investigation, we quote from it at some length. Augustine pin-points the relationship which exists between the rhetoric of Scripture writers like Paul and that required of Christian preachers.

> At this point, perhaps, someone may ask whether our authors, whose divinely inspired writings have formed the Canon with an authority that is very beneficial for us, are only wise, or whether they should be designated as eloquent also. Certainly for myself and for those who agree with me in what I maintain, this question is very readily answered. For, when I understand them, it seems to me that not only could no one be wiser, but also that no one could be more eloquent than they are. And I venture to maintain that all who understand correctly what those writers are saying understand at the same time that they should not have said it any other way. A certain kind of eloquence is more fitting for youth, and another is more becoming for old age; so much so that we should not call it eloquence if it is not appropriate for the person of the speaker. There is a kind of eloquence, then, which is becoming for men eminently worthy of the highest authority and manifestly inspired by God. Biblical writers have spoken with this kind of eloquence; no other kind becomes them, nor is that kind suitable for other writers. It is appropriate for them, and the more humble it seems to be, the higher it rises above others, not because of its conceit, but because of its solidity.[1]

---

[1]John J. Gavigan (tr.), "Christian Instruction," Saint Augustine, Vol. IV of The Fathers of the Church ed. Ludwig Schopp et al. (72 vols.; New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc., 1947), pp. 175-176.

> Still, if there were time, I could point out to those who set their own language ahead of that of our writers (not because of its greatness but because of its extravagance) that all the qualities and oratorical ornaments they boast about are found in the sacred writings of those whom divine Providence has provided to instruct us and lead us from this wicked world to the blessed one. It is not what these men have in common with pagan orators and poets that gives me more pleasure in that eloquence than I can say. I feel greater admiration and surprise because they have used our eloquence in a way which is all their own, so that it is neither lacking nor ostentatious in them. It was not right for them either to condemn eloquence nor to make a display of it. The former would have happened if they had avoided it, and the latter could have been believed of them if they had made their eloquence easily recognizable. And, in those places where it happens to be recognized by the learned, such matters are being discussed that the words by which they are expressed seem not to have been sought after by the speaker, but to have been associated naturally with those very matters, as if you were to understand wisdom as going out of her home, that is, the heart of the wise man, and eloquence like an inseparable servant following her even though unbidden.[1]

Augustine proceeds to give examples of eloquence from the epistles of Paul, and then declares:

> It would be tedious to recount other examples or to indicate these in other passages of the Holy Scriptures. What if I had tried to point out also the figures of speech which are taught in the art of rhetoric and are present in those passages at least which I have quoted from the Apostle's eloquence? Is it not true that thoughtful men would more readily have believed that I am going to excess rather than that any students would have felt that I was meeting their needs? When all these principles are taught by masters, they are considered of great value, are purchased at a high price, and are sold with considerable display. I myself have a dread of being tainted by that ostentation while I am discussing these matters in this way. However, I must give an answer to the ill-informed men who believe that our authors should be despised not because they do not possess, but because they do not make a display of, the eloquence which those others value too highly.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 176-177.

[2] Ibid., pp. 181-182.

And in another place, after discussing a Scriptural example of oratory Augustine adds:

> Indeed, many points which apply to the rules of eloquence can be discovered in this very passage which I have used as an example. A sincere reader is not so much instructed when he carefully analyzes it as he is set on fire when he recites it with glowing feeling. For, not by human effort were these words devised; they have been poured forth from the Mind of God both wisely and eloquently, so that wisdom was not bent upon eloquence, nor did eloquence separate itself from wisdom. As some very eloquent and intelligent men could observe and maintain, if those principles which are learned in the art of oratory could not be respected, observed, and brought to these teachings, unless they were first discovered in the natural ability of orators, is it any wonder that they are discovered in those men sent by Him who creates natural abilities? Therefore, let us admit that our canonical writers and teachers were not only wise, but truly eloquent, with such an eloquence as was appropriate for persons of this kind.[1]

Augustine not only gives from the writings of Paul examples of the three classic styles, but he argues from the words of the Apostle the necessity for the preacher's employing the best style possible on each and every occasion.

> A teacher like this, in order to make his words persuasive, expresses himself without shame, not only in the subdued and moderate style, but even in the grand style, because he lives uprightly. He chooses a good life in such a way that he does not disregard a good reputation, but as far as possible, takes forethought for what is 'honorable in the sight of God and men,' by fearing God and taking care of men. Even in his very speech he should choose to please by his subjects rather than by his words, and not believe that a thing is better expressed unless it is expressed more truthfully. The teacher should not be a slave to words, but the words should be subject to the teacher. This is what the Apostle says: 'Not with the wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ be made void.' What he says to Timothy has this meaning, too: 'Do not dispute with words, for that is useless, leading to the ruin of the listeners.' This was not said so that we would not say anything in defense of truth when our enemies

---

[1]Ibid., p. 187.

are attacking it. Where shall we place what he said when he was explaining, among other things, what kind of man a bishop should be: 'That he may be able in sound doctrine also to confute opponents'? Disputing with words is not being solicitous how error may be overcome by truth, but how your eloquence may be preferred to another's. A man who does not dispute with words, whether he speaks in the subdued, the moderate, or the grand style, strives by means of his words to make truth clear, pleasing, and persuasive. Even charity itself, which is the end and 'fulfillment of the Law,' cannot be right in any way, if the things which are loved are not true but false. Moreover, just as one whose body is handsome, but whose mind is deranged, is more to be pitied than if his body also were misshapen, so those who say eloquently things that are false are more to be pitied than if they said such things inelegantly. Therefore, in what does speaking, not only eloquently, but also wisely, consist except in employing adequate words in the subdued style, brilliant ones in the moderate style, and forceful ones in the grand style, yet always on a subject which deserves to be heard? Whoever cannot do both should speak wisely what he does not say eloquently, rather than speak eloquently what he says foolishly.[1]

St. Augustine draws also from Paul in his discussion on Ethos.

However, in causing his words to be persuasive, the life of a speaker has greater influence than any sublimity of eloquence, no matter how great it may be. A man who speaks wisely and eloquently, but leads a wicked life, does indeed teach many who are desirous of learning, yet, as it is written, he is 'unprofitable to his own soul.' Hence the Apostle says: 'whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is being proclaimed.' However, Christ is 'Truth' and truth can still be preached even though not with truth, that is, that what is virtuous and true may be preached from a vicious and deceitful heart. So, Jesus Christ is truly preached by those who 'seek their own interests, not those of Jesus Christ.' However, good Christians do not obey any man at all, but the Lord Himself who said: 'The things they command do; but do not do the things they do; for they talk but do nothing.' For that reason, even those who do not lead useful lives are heard with profit. They are diligent about seeking their own ends, but, naturally, they do not dare to teach their own doctrines from the pulpit of ecclesiastical authority, which sound teaching has established. For this reason the Lord Himself, before He said what I have

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 231-232.

related about such men, declared: 'They have sat on the chair of Moses.' That chair, then, which was not theirs but Moses', compelled them to speak what was good, even though they were not doing good. They accomplished their own purposes in their own lives, but the chair which belonged to another did not permit them to teach their own doctrines.

And so, they benefit many by preaching what they do not practise, but they would benefit far greater numbers by practising what they preach. For, there are many who seek a defense of their own evil lives in their directors and teachers, replying in their hearts, or even with their lips (if they give vent to this extent), and saying: 'Why do you not practise yourself what you are preaching to me?' The result is that they do not listen with submission to a man who does not listen to himself. They despise the word of God which is being preached to them, and at the same time they despise the preacher himself. In fact, when the Apostle, writing to Timothy, had said: 'Let no man despise thy youth,' and added how he was to avoid being despised, he said: 'but be thou an example to the faithful in speech, in conduct, in charity, in faith, in chastity.'[1]

Taking into account, therefore, both the testimony of the ancient homiletician Augustine and that which proceeds from his modern counterparts, we can assay an answer to the question regarding the extent of Paul's influence on homiletic theory. The Apostle's influence has unquestionably been one of the major factors in molding current preaching ideals if not THE major one. It should be recognized, however, that not only the authors of the epistles, but the prophets of the Old Testament and, indeed, every writer of Scripture has contributed to the distinctive tenets of the homiletic tradition. This is understandable inasmuch as the Bible writers, almost without exception, were also preachers in their own right.

We believe that the conclusions of Rudin regarding "the concept of ethos in late American preaching" are complementary to the present

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 229-231.

rhetorical analysis of Paul's epistles. They account for the divergencies from classical rhetoric in certain particulars, revealing that the fundamental premises of ambassadorship and authority found in preaching require not merely the evincing but also the possession of the qualities of ethos. The oratory of the one who purports to convey the absolutes of heaven should exemplify both art and incarnation. In Paul's case, this ideal appears to have been realized.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RELEVANCE OF PAULINE ETHICS FOR MODERN COMMUNICATION

> Can it be denied that so fearsomely potent a force as rhetoric participates in moral values? Is it the case that any instrument which affects human life is not subject to moral assessment? Aristotle affirmed the moral neutrality of rhetoric; Plato's answer to both these questions was an emphatic negative. When in recent history we find the clamorous spirit of fanaticism at large in the world sustained by rhetorical discourse; when we contemplate the undiminished and undiminishing potentiality for savagery latent in all men, waiting to be triggered by suasive language; and when we observe the Sophists of our time, rationally discredited but thriving still, we may begin to suspect that after all Plato was even wiser than we had thought.[1]

> Things fall apart; the center cannot hold;
> Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world;
> . . . . . .
> The best lack all conviction, while the worst
> Are full of passionate intensity.[2]

---

[1]Edwin Black, "Plato's View of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 44 (December 1958), p. 374.

[2]William Butler Yeats, The Second Coming, cited by Nathan A. Scott, Jr., The Broken Center (New York: The National Council, 1959), p. 1.

No attempt has been made in this chapter to outline Paul's ethical code in a specific way because it consists mainly of principles familiar in name at least to most Westerners from childhood. Concise ethical summaries in the Apostle's own words are to be found in Romans ch 12, 1 Thessalonians chs 4 and 5, Ephesians ch 5, and 1 Corinthians ch 13.

Our objective here is to inquire into the need for a revival of ethical values in communication, and to suggest that Pauline ethics are the most appropriate to fulfill the existing need.

In 1848, Marx and Engels, in their Manifesto of the Communist Party, wrote that "law, morality, religion are . . . so many bourgeois interests."[1] In the same document they emphasized that "man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the condition of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life."[2] Such statements added flame to the fires of the materialistic philosophy of the preceding age of the Enlightenment. By the end of the century it seemed apparent that the theory of Charles Darwin concerning man's evolutionary development substantiated the positivism of men like Marx. Nietzsche realized the implications of Darwinism, and hailed the passing of God and the enthronement of the power-motivated "superman" in His place. Following the death of Nietzsche, the works of Sigmund Freud made their impact upon the world suggesting to many that man, like his primeval ancestors, was glandularly controlled rather than rationally.

These events were the antecedents of the modern era of ethical chaos in the realm of communication and other areas. With the demotion of man as a spiritual being came the tumbling of ethical pillars which had mainly rested on metaphysical foundations.

> "Give man a concept of what he is, and he will do what he ought," is a philosophical observation which seems to have been confirmed by history.
>
> Conversely, when we give man a concept of himself which does not extend beyond the pleasure-pain dimensions of his being, he will not spontaneously undertake duties no matter what efforts are made to have him do so.[3]

---

[1]Manifesto of the Communist Party, cited by Carl Henry, The Drift of Western Thought (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1951), p. 60.

[2]Ibid., p. 60.

[3]Ana Maria O'Neill, Ethics for the Atomic Age (Boston: Meador Publishing Company, 1948), p. 74.

Thus with man's change of concept regarding himself and the universe there has come a subsequent revolution of thought concerning ethics. These two are ever linked. Ethics are always based on a Weltanschauung, and its basic presuppositions are drawn from the world-view which is its parent. Thus it has been truly said concerning our day that--"the essential nature of the crisis through which we are living is neither military, nor political, nor economic, but moral."[1] [emphasis ours]

Sorokin asserts the same when he says:

> This means that the main issue of our times is not democracy versus totalitarianism, nor liberty versus despotism; neither is it capitalism versus communism, nor pacifism versus militarism, nor internationalism versus nationalism, nor any of the current popular issues daily proclaimed by statesmen and politicians, professors and ministers, journalists and soapbox orators. All these popular issues are but small side issues--mere by-products of the main issue, namely, the sensate form of culture and way of life versus another, different form.[2]

Or as he puts it elsewhere in the same work:

> The essence of the crisis consists in a progressive devaluation of our ethics and of the norms of our law. This devaluation has already gone so far that, strange as it may seem, they have lost a great deal of their prestige as ethical and juridical values. They have little, if any, of the sanctity with which such values and norms were formerly invested. More and more, present-day ethical values are looked upon as mere "rationalizations," "derivations," or "beautiful speech reactions" veiling the egotistic interests, pecuniary motives, and acquisitive propensities of individuals and groups. Increasingly they are regarded as a smoke screen masking prosaic interests, selfish lusts, and, in particular, greed for material values. Legal norms, likewise, are increasingly considered as a device of the group in power

---

[1]Edward H. Carr, Conditions of Peace, p. 113, cited by Ana Maria O'Neill, Ethics for the Atomic Age (Boston: Meador Publishing Company, 1948), p. 389.

[2]P. A. Sorokin, The Crisis of Our Age (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1946), p. 22.

for exploiting other, less powerful, groups--a form of trickery employed by the dominant class for the subjugation and control of the subordinate classes. Ethical and juridical norms have both become mere rouge and powder to deck out a fairly unattractive body of Marxian economic interests, Paretian "residues," Freudian "libido," Ratzenhoger "interests," the psychologists' and sociologists' "complexes," "drives," and "preponent reflexes." They have turned into mere appendages of policemen, prisons, the electric chair, "pressures," and the other forms of physical force. They have lost their moral prestige and have been degraded and demoted to the status of a device, used by clever hypocrites to fool the exploited simpletons.[1]

The dream described by Dostoyevsky in the Epilogue of Crime and Punishment seems to be a parable concerning this age as foreseen by the author. Aware of the significance of the new matter and method in current communication, Dostoyevsky pictures the whole world under process of disintegration because of a terrible and strange plague. New kinds of microbes possessing intelligence and will attacked the bodies of men. Those who were infected became mad and furious. But "never had men considered themselves so intellectual and so completely in possession of the truth as these sufferers, never had they considered their decisions, their scientific conclusions, their moral convictions so infallible."[2] Entire towns, cities, and nations went insane because of the infection. In their fury they could no longer understand one another. "Each thought that he alone had the truth and was wretched looking at the others. . . . They did not know how to judge and could not agree what to consider evil and what good."[3]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 157.

[2]Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Crime and Punishment (New York: The Modern Library, Random House, Inc., 1950), p. 528.

[3]Ibid., p. 528, (emphasis ours).

In senseless rage they killed one another with their armies. All day long, alarms rang in the towns and cities, but when men rushed together they were unable to find why or by whom they had been summoned. Trades were abandoned, and the land was permitted to lie fallow. "Men met in groups, agreed on something, swore to keep together, but at once began on something quite different from what they had proposed. They accused one another, fought and killed each other."[1] Conflagrations and famine spread over the world until "all men and all things were involved in destruction."[2] Dostoyevsky concludes his description by saying:

> Only a few men could be saved in the whole world. They were a pure chosen people, destined to found a new race and a new life, to renew and purify the earth, but no one had seen these men, no one had heard their words and their voices.[3]

This remarkable narrative portrays many aspects of the tragedy of this mid-twentieth century and suggests what may yet lie ahead. It is most significant that Dostoyevsky points out that a distinguishing characteristic of the crisis which he pictures was the fact that the people "did not know how to judge and could not agree what to consider evil and what good." That is to say, they possessed no agreed-upon ethical values. It is this characteristic, according to many diagnosticians of our times, which particularly marks the present human dilemma.

That communication today in many areas both reflects and fosters ethical chaos is the theme of the present essay. The world crisis is actually the crisis of communication. It has arisen through

---

[1] Ibid., p. 529.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

both communication and the lack of it. Events do not happen in a vacuum. It is the verbal interchange between nations, communities, and individuals that precipitates change. It is the projection of thought by orators, politicians, scientists, literary figures, philosophers, and others that has created our troubled age. It is the widespread influence of communicated concepts which has brought "Mind to the End of its Tether," to borrow a phrase from one who was originally an optimistic prophet of a coming Utopia.[1] As a man announces his thought by words, so an age manifests its true nature by the quality of its various forms of communication. Therefore, it is proposed to array in this chapter some of the evidence that prevalent forms of communication reveal the necessity for a revival of ethical values. There need be no apology for this stress upon ethics. Every competent student of world affairs recognizes such a stress as the urgent need of the times.

> If it has not been evident to men before that we must be guided in our social life by universal and necessary ethical rules, it certainly is clear today. With the nations trembling for fear as the west and the east feel each other out for a Third World War; with stock piles of atom bombs being kept in order 'just in case'; with world diplomats vetoing each other out of commission; with starvation, disease, and death marking the aftermath of the recently consummated world-holocaust; and with the threat of economic revolution looming over the entire human race, one can appreciate why even the followers of the scientific method are meeting together in seminars throughout the length and breadth of the country, discussing what can be done to protect civilization from utter destruction in an atom-bomb war. Such discussion is good and necessary. . . .[2]

---

[1]H. G. Wells, Mind at the End of Its Tether (New York: Didier, 1946).

[2]Edward John Carnell, An Introduction to Christian Apologetics (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), p. 315.

At one time Ethics might have been considered a dull hobby of a duller academician. This is not true today. Ethics is the incisive and universal requisite for survival. . . . Theological sanctions discarded, the modern man covets only social, and sometimes only individual, approval of his behavior. The sense of ethical imperative is evaporating from one range of life after another. The obligation to durable principles is no longer insisted upon. The soul of the twentieth-century man no longer feeds on objective and eternal norms, but is content with ethical leftovers.

One fact is certain: simultaneous with this relativity of moral imperatives, human life has lost its worth. The soul-nausea and dread of modern man has reached depths unknown even to the ancient Greek skeptic. The sense of cosmic lostness and of personal insignificance frames modern man's window on life.

On a mass scale, the value of human existence is almost totally discounted. The nadir of man's worth finds its supreme illustrations not in the deeds of earlier centuries, but in those of our own: barbarism in Nazi concentration camps; brutal state compulsion under Soviet totalitarianism; slave labor camps; suspension of human rights upon the whim of political machines; scientific devotion to weapons efficient for wholesale death-dealing; mass atomic destruction of whole civilian populations (Nagasaki and Hiroshima) by world powers promoting the cause of human dignity. The power which awes modern man is his capacity to destroy a million lives a minute, to eradicate the vestiges of civilization almost overnight, to shake the very globe on which he exists. In our day the "might makes right" credo of Thrasymachus and Machiavelli and Nietzsche has become a politico-social option beyond the worst dreams of the tyrants who shaped it.

The dissolved and lost value of human life is a fact not only in the aggregate, but in the individual composition of society. The evaporation of ethical restraints has emptied life of meaning and of sense of destiny. The fibres of morality have disintegrated in society, in fact, because they first deteriorated in the family. Basic to the chaos in social ethics stands the decline of personal moral conviction and its accompanying sense of futility. Individual life seems cut-rate, even give-away, with the loss of fixed standards and of an enduring goal. Personal existence in the 1950's means the malnourished soul, the diseased moral life, and dissipated sense of worth.[1]

---

[1]Carl Henry, Christian Personal Ethics (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), pp. 13-14.

The field of communication, or any single aspect of it, is too extensive to cover adequately in a single chapter. Therefore, the present survey will be limited to tracing some of the indications of communication trends in (1) recent political demagoguery in America and Germany, (2) some outstanding features of current advertising through mass media, and (3) the characteristics of modern literature.

In the second section of this chapter the apparent causes for the decline in ethics will be indicated in order that some solution for this collapse of values might be proposed.

With special emphasis we would postulate that the indications of unethical procedures in communication are not significant for their revelation that a minority of individuals lack moral standards. This has ever been the case, and merely to point it out afresh would be labor lost. The important fact is that the increasing success of such communicators suggests, not the low mentality of the masses, but their willingness to respond to unethical stimuli. In the words of an old Book: "An appalling and horrible thing has happened in the land: the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests rule at their direction; my people love to have it so. . . ."[1]

Until World War I such an assumption regarding the ethical deterioration of the race would have been blasphemy, for the essential goodness of man had been taken for granted by many of the intelligentsia since the days of Rousseau. Created by humanistic Greece, and propagated by Rome, the concept was revived during the Enlightenment which taught that men would act rightly if given the opportunity to know the right. On this premise was built the general belief in the law of Progress which characterized the last half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. World Wars I and II,

---

[1]Jer. 5:30, 31. RSV

however, have practically destroyed the once prevalent view. Thus we would repeat that the evidence concerning the regrettable practices of many communicators indicates that a large number among the masses are willing to respond to unethical motivation. We would suggest that this number is much larger than in any preceding century. David Reisman, in his portrayal of "the changing American character," in The Lonely Crowd has pointed out the large scale development of the "outer-directed" man who readily conforms to external pressures and motivation because he lacks definite standards of his own. This trend to conformity has given serious concern to many sociologists of our day. On reflection it becomes apparent that the willingness to conform is far from being a healthy sign. The ensuing description of communication trends, therefore, is meant to stress, not merely the nature of the practices themselves and their perpetrators, but the moral weakness of the increasingly large number who choose to respond to unethical stimuli. This tragic situation indicates a breakdown in moral education which demands a remedy.

Political Demagoguery in U. S. A. and Germany

During the great depression of the thirties, America was afflicted with a rash of demagogues. These popular orators were well aware that empty stomachs made men increasingly aware of the limitations of their ethical standards and consequently vulnerable to the verbal bribes of politicians. The fact that demagogues may not have been as numerous since the thirties does not indicate that human nature has changed, but only that not as many stomachs are now empty, and that therefore fewer individuals are susceptible to the former oratorical appeals. Briefly we would trace the careers of a few memorable demagogues, reminding ourselves that these men had

success in our own generation in the most "enlightened" nation on earth. It will be noticed particularly that the economic bribe was one of the most appropriate tools in the propagandist kit of the following figures.

A novel by a well-known Washington political reporter pointed the way for would-be dictators via demagoguery. In this work a United States Senator is pictured as saying:

> Never make a speech without referring to sweat-toiling masses. Do not, under any circumstances, allow yourself to overdress . . . but do not underestimate the value of a plug hat and a frock coat on occasions. Be dignified, but not too dignified. Be familiar, but not too familiar. Gauge your public carefully, and be all things to all men. . . . Never take a drink with a clergyman, but never fail to buy one for a ward boss. . . . Truth-telling in politics is the mark of the inexperienced politician, but be careful to lie skilfully, and always remember how you lied. . . . As you are a Democrat, you may go as far as you like with Thomas Jefferson. Also, uphold the Constitution, assail the Standard Oil Company savagely, lambast the octopi for hours and hours, and assault the Money Devil and Wall Street. . . . Always refer to the ladies--God bless 'em--and throw in a few flowery sentences about the children who are the future guardians of the Republic. Again, the people, the dear common people, are the most fruitful topic in the world for political eloquence. . . . Unceasing assaults on the citadels of privilege and plutocracy as maintained by the Republican Party, and long interpretation of the Democratic platform, with some kind words about the Fathers and the dear Constitution, will give you ample material.[1]

This volume became the political primer of Huey P. Long and we know not how many others of the stump trail.

Among those who diligently pursued the counsel of the fictitious Senator was Theodore Gilmore Bilbo, self-styled as "The Man."

> In a career of almost half a century, Bilbo was to make one "comeback" after the other, despite a short sentence served

---

[1]Reinhold H. Luthin, American Demagogues: Twentieth Century, p. 15, citing Samuel G. Blythe's The Fakers.

> in jail and numerous charges of graft and broken promises. Although "sedate" citizens winced at being represented in high public offices by The Man, enough Mississippi supporters always rallied to afflict the state with what the critics diagnosed as the "Bilbonic Plague."[1]

While politics beckoned to Bilbo as early as 1901, we are interested in his propaganda appeals of the thirties. After losing a race for Congress and securing the job of "Paste-master General" (manager of a newspaper clipping department) of Roosevelt's administration, Bilbo was quiet for a short period. Then such criticism as the above appellation stirred him to run against Senator Hubert Stephens in the 1934 Democratic primary. The following quotation reveals the typical economic appeal.

> At a monster barbecue, Bilbo presented a twenty-seven point program--something for everybody except the "interests." The points included a "share-the-wealth" promise of cheaper money for farmers, federal aid to schools, immediate payment of the bonus to World War I veterans, pensions for oldsters, higher wages and shorter hours and unemployment insurance for workers, more federal funds for the destitute, federal funds for highway construction, federal funds for the blind, and a "square deal" for rural letter-carriers.[2]

The reality beneath this political front is indicated by his Dream House at Juniper Grove. It contained twenty-seven rooms with five tiled bathrooms.

In 1938 he announced a plan which would solve the unemployment problem. The proposal was to ship 12,000,000 Negroes to Africa, and establish a Greater Liberia.

"Alfalfa" Bill Murray was another of the same tradition. He also saw in the days of gold paucity his golden opportunity.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 44.

[2]Ibid., p. 63.

> . . . in a year when farmers were plagued by mortgages, droughts, crop surpluses, and falling prices, when the bottom had dropped out of the oil market prices, and when the lead and zinc mines of the northeastern region had shut down, many Oklahomans looked up to "Alfalfa Bill" as the prophet of better times.[1]

He dressed as though hard-hit himself by the depression tragedy. Hand-me-down trousers which were unpressed, a soiled cotton shirt, and socks from a ten-cent-store, stamped him as "one of the people."

No one could deny that Murray was generous. During his first year in office there were over one thousand employees added to the state payroll and payroll expenses soared $50,000 a month. Yes, all his friends knew that "Alfalfa Bill" was generous. And the prisoners found him "kind." Did he not grant nearly six hundred pardons that first twelve months? Also indicative of his economic appeal was his presidential slogan: "Bread, Butter, Bacon, and Beans." Like every demagogue he employed name-calling devices meant to stimulate the prejudices of his hearers. Wall Street became "That vicious gambling den that controls all our loans." A special round of speeches was delivered to the distressed agricultural state of North Dakota in the endeavor to win the presidential primary there. For the wealthy classes, choice invective was reserved--"backbiters," "varmints," "polecats," "highbinders," and "craven wolves of plutocracy" were among his favorites. After a period in retirement "Alfalfa Bill" came forth as an organizer of an association whose chief objective was tax equality. His former success was not to be retrieved and by 1939 once more in retirement he was writing The Finished Scholar, a volume advising procedure in manners, mathematics, punctuation, grammar, and public speaking. In the forties he was to enter the political arena once more, but without his old glory.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 111.

A demagogue of similar proportions was Eugene Talmadge, "The Wild Man" of Sugar Creek, Georgia.

> In the fury unleashed by the agrarian agitation in Georgia during the mid-1920's, a humorless man with an unruly forelock of jet black hair, who wore red galluses and "Harold Lloyd" spectacles, leaped from the obscurity of a Telfair County law office to state and national prominence.
>
> From 1926 to 1946 Eugene Talmadge took to the hustings in every state Democratic primary in election in Georgia. Adopting a rural "Cracker" accent and snapping his gaudy suspenders for emphasis as he poured forth invective on his foes, the so-called "Wild Man of Sugar Creek" exploited the farmer's fears and prejudices.[1]

In the twenties, cotton had sunk as low as eight cents a pound. Peaches and watermelons hardly paid for their freight expenses to market. Talmadge's campaign stationery was stamped with the caption:

A REAL DIRT FARMER
Talmadge Against the Machine
Eugene Talmadge
Candidate for
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Thus he indicated the pattern of his program for two decades. As governor in the thirties he had both henhouse and barn erected in the Executive Mansion grounds and declared loudly that the bellowing of livestock and the cackling of poultry were essential to lull him to sleep at nights. One of his first executive acts was drastically to reduce the price of automobile tags. By 1934 he felt strong enough to contest FDR for leadership of the nation. He opposed the President on the issues of the allotment of federal relief funds, N.R.A., and farm policy.

Of particular interest is Luthin's comment regarding the oral approach of Talmadge.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 182.

> When looking for the farm vote, Gene aped the Cracker speech of rural Georgia, concealing his college training beneath unpolished locutions as he assailed "frills" in government, and "nigger-lovin' furriners." He defined his enemy: "Anyone who attempts to impose ideas that are contrary to the established traditions of Georgia is a 'furriner'." In addressing city audiences Talmadge's grammar and diction were vastly improved, his ranting modified.[1]

He specialized in old-fashioned country political rallies which were often a cross between an all-out barbecue and a carnival with vaudeville. Musical performers travelled with him to please the inhabitants of sparsely populated counties.

Like Theodore Bilbo, Talmadge endeavored to mold the state's educational system according to his personal biases, but this interference led him to political catastrophe. Once he asked a reporter. "Do you think I'm a damned fool?" The answer was: "Well, Governor, some think you're a damned fool, some think you're a dictator, some think you're a demagogue, and some think you're just as mean as hell."

The year 1932 witnessed "The Louisiana Kingfish" Huey P. Long as a member of the United States Senate. His famous slogan "Every Man a King but no Man wears a Crown" had been borrowed from a speech of William Jennings Bryan in 1900, and it had powerful economic overtones. By 1935, "Share-Our-Wealth" clubs were springing up throughout the South, and in parts of the North. That year, Long sang over a radio station in New Orleans his presidential campaign song.

> Why sleep or slumber, America?
> Land of brave and true;
> With castles, clothing, and food for all,
> All belongs to you.
>
> (Chorus)
> Ev'ry man a king; ev'ry man a king;

---

[1]Ibid., p. 197.

For you can be a millionaire.
But there's something belonging to others,
There's enough for all people to share.
When its sunny June or December too,
Or in the Winter time or Spring,
There'll be peace without end,
Every neighbor a friend,
With ev'ry man a king.

When Huey Long was assassinated, another demagogue rose to praise him. This was Father Coughlin, who referred to Long's death as "the most regrettable thing in modern history."[1] Here was a demagogue who also saw in the economic plight of the nation an opportunity for wielding power over the multitudes via oratory. Coughlin called not only for "a living annual wage" but also for "Nationalization of banking and currency and of national resources."[2] Coughlin at first endorsed the program of Roosevelt but later became one of his bitterest critics. Like the demagogues of Dixie, he also used race-hatred for motivation, as well as promises of plenty via his financial schemes.[3] The radio-priest demonstrated that it was not only the less fortunate Southerners who were susceptible to high powered, prejudice-centered propaganda. So powerful did Coughlin become that Roosevelt selected the former Head of the National Recovery Administration, General Hugh Johnson, to assail him over the radio as a "Pied-Piper" and a deluder of the people. The "Louisiana Kingfish" was also castigated by Johnson at this time.

These are but a few of the figures conspicuous in America's recent demagogic tradition. It is obvious that each of these was an apt scholar in the School of Propaganda and possessed the prerequisite

---

[1]Ibid., p. 270.

[2]Frederick Lewis Allen, Since Yesterday: The Nineteen Thirties in America (Toronto: Blue Ribbon Books, 1943), p. 189.

[3]Father Coughlin was a pronounced anti-semitist.

of a character unhampered by ethical "shackles." Across the waters, similar patterns (though more sober in presentation) had begun to be manifested in the late twenties among a smarting, defeated race.

Nazi Demagoguery

In Germany not only finances but national pride had been rendered tenuous and shaky as a result of the unsuccessful war of 1914-18. The man for the hour was a demagogue even more able than his American parallels. What did he have to say concerning the science of propaganda in his own confession of faith, Mein Kampf? The following statements indicate the core of his philosophy in this regard.

> Propaganda's task is, for instance, not to evaluate the various rights, but far more to stress exclusively the one that is to be represented by it. It has not to search into truth as far as this is favorable to others, in order to present it then to the masses with doctrinary honesty, but it has rather to serve its own truth uninterruptedly.[1]

> The people, in an overwhelming majority, are so feminine in their nature and attitude that their activities and thoughts are motivated less by sober consideration than by feeling and sentiment.
>
> This sentiment, however, is not complicated but very simple and complete. There are not many differentiations, but rather a positive or a negative; love or hate, right or wrong, truth or lie; but never half this and half that, or partially, etc.[2]

> All propaganda has to be popular and has to adapt its spiritual level to the perception of the least intelligent of those towards whom it intends to direct itself. Therefore its spiritual level has to be screwed the lower, the greater the mass of people which one wants to attract. But if the problem involved, like the propaganda for carrying on a war, is to include an entire people

---

[1]Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939), p. 236.

[2]Ibid., p. 237.

> in its field of action, the caution in avoiding too high spiritual assumptions cannot be too great.
>
> The more modest, then, its scientific ballast is, and the more it exclusively considers the feelings of the masses, the more striking will be its success. This, however, is the best proof whether a particular piece of propaganda is right or wrong, and not the successful satisfaction of a few scholars or 'aesthetic' languishing monkeys.[1]

At the party congress in Nuremberg in 1936 Hitler declared: "Propaganda brought us into power, propaganda has since enabled us to remain in power, and propaganda will give us the means of conquering the world."[2] Typical of his instructions for the conducting of mass meetings are the following:

> (1) When musicians or a gramophone or radiogram are available, distract the audience as they come into the meeting, especially by playing rousing popular airs.
> (2) Maintain the excitement and the dynamism of the audience at an increasing pitch up to the end of the meeting.
> (3) From time to time, start an argument between the speaker or another person and the crowd in the hall, throwing out questions and instigating collective replies--"Yes!", "No", etc. A mass affirmation of this sort acts on the crowd like an electric shock and stimulates its ardour.
> (4) Have songs before and after the speeches. Songs to be sung always standing, never seated.
> (5) Speeches must never exceed thirty minutes.
> (6) Play out the audience at the end with a popular fighting song.
> (7) If possible, present an amusing sketch, or a chorus sung or spoken, or have appropriate verses declaimed.
> (8) A symbolic tableau, or illuminated placard, dynamic and cheerful, or sarcastic, accompanied by music, may be useful as light relief.
> (9) Incite the audience to make the revolutionary gesture from time to time: shout "Freedom!", with the clenched fist raised.
> (10) Decorate the hall with cloths bearing slogans and symbols,

---

[1]Ibid., p. 232.

[2]Serge Chakotin, The Rape of the Masses (London: Butler and Tanner Ltd., 1940), p. 174.

> with flags, greenery, etc.; have in the hall a group of young militants as stewards, in uniform and wearing arm-bands with the emblem.[1]

Undoubtedly Adolf Hitler was a master of mob psychology, and the preceding indicates the careful attention he gave to insignia, bands, uniforms, symbols, bunting, expectant waiting periods, compact seating, etc. It was his objective to heighten emotional processes and to lower rational processes. Prejudices and frustrations, needs and fears, were played upon by this master demagogue. In number his main ideas were few, and these were aimed at a low level of intelligence. His procedure was entirely Machiavellian.

In summary it can be said that Hitler's propaganda was characterized by three elements:

> . . . the ignoring of moral considerations, the appeal to the emotions of the masses by the use of the "first" (combative) instinct as basis, and the employment of rational methods for the formation of conditioned reflexes inducing conformity in the masses.[2]

In both American and German demagoguery it is easy to perceive the employment of the typical propaganda techniques which have been often enumerated as follows--Band-Wagon, Card-Stacking, Glittering Generality, Name-Calling, Plain-Folks, Testimonial, Transfer.[3]

The impressive feature of the lives of the foregoing demagogues is that the masses enthusiastically elevated them to power. This was not merely because skillful propaganda short-circuited rational processes in listeners. It was also because the appeals to greed and selfishness found responses in minds and hearts without high ethical standards.

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 171-172.

[2]Ibid., p. 183.

[3]Clyde R. Miller, Propaganda Analysis, Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Vol. 1, No. 2 (November, 1937), pp. 1-3.

Use of the Mass Media

Propaganda is spread not only by the mass meeting. It is not even chiefly spread this way. Modern communication techniques multiply the spread of ideas in a way hitherto unknown. For example, a single speaker today, through the agencies of television, radio, and newspaper can reach more people in a single day than a whole corps of nineteenth century orators could have reached in a generation.

The mass media inevitably became the instrument of politics, with resultant good and ill. During the last fifteen years commercial public relations experts have done much to mold public political opinion on a nation wide scale.

> For the public relations man the press and the other media are not only distributors of information but instruments of social control, and the media have for various reasons been forced to accept this estimate of themselves.[1]

It helps us to realise something of the scope of the mass media to consider the following list of the present channels for public communication in America.

1,800 daily newspapers
10,000 weekly newspapers
7,600 magazines
2,000 trade journals
7,635 periodicals geared to race groups
100,000,000 radio sets
12,000,000 TV sets
15,000 motion-picture houses
6,000 house organs.[2]

According to Fortune "nearly half the content of the nation's better

---

[1]Thomas R. Nilsen, "Free Speech, Persuasion, and the Democratic Process," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (October, 1958) p. 239.

[2]Vance Packard, The Hidden Persuaders (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1959), p. 187.

newspapers comes from publicity releases."[1] As Thomas R. Nilsen remarks "Publicity releases, we may remind ourselves, are not random revelations of information but statements carefully chosen for the effect they will have."[2]

What is there that is contrary to high ethical values in the public relations use of the mass media? The answer includes many elements, but the chief contravention of moral rights is the calculated endeavor to shortcut the rational processes of listeners and readers. Democracy is founded on belief in the dignity of the individual human being. It assumes that mankind is superior to the brute creation, that he is not ruled by instinct, and that he has the capacity to make conscious rational choice. These assumptions have been established as correct by the sciences. Contrary to popular opinion, Freud's work did not demonstrate that man was entirely dominated by subconscious desire. Rather, Freud endeavored to prove that man is capable of bringing to the surface of his knowledge the facts regarding his subconscious conflicts and, through his awareness of such, be enabled to resolve and govern his personal behavior. Neither the extreme Freudians, who would attribute all man's behavior to sex, or the extreme dialectical materialists who shift the biological area of control from the sex glands to the stomach, have adequate scientific support for their hypotheses. While man is influenced strongly by his emotions and his physiological drives, he is capable of making decisions which are largely determined by rational grounds.

This is the basis of the democratic view of the sacredness of the individual and his right to choose. "Democracy rejects the premise that the 'people is a beast,' that the individual is an instinctual creature

---

[1]Nilsen, p. 239.

[2]Ibid., p. 239.

who can only be moved by the manipulation of his emotions and reflexes.'"[1] On these grounds, all persuasive endeavors which attempt to short-circuit the decision-making process by means of eclipsing the rational by emotional appeal are unethical. Emotion's place is to reinforce reason, not to eclipse it.

Franklyn Haiman speaks similarly in his discussion of modern advertising and propaganda methods:

> . . . They attempt to make him buy, vote, or believe in a certain way by short-circuiting his conscious thought processes and planting suggestions or exerting pressures on the periphery of his consciousness which are intended to produce automatic, nonreflective behavior. The methods are similar to those of Pavlov's famous conditioned-reflex experiments with dogs. Ring a bell and the dog salivates. No thought processes intervene here. Non-critical reflex action--this is the goal of the hidden persuader.[2]

When we remember that most people are subjected to the influence of newspapers and similar channels of advertising and propaganda for more years than they attend school and college, the magnitude of the problem will be sensed. Furthermore, recent studies show that "most Americans now spend between three and six hours a day, on the average with mass communication. This probably compares with not much more than an hour fifty years ago, and considerably less one hundred years ago."[3]

Another unethical aspect of propaganda as employed by demagogues and advertisers is the deliberate attempt to avoid alternative or competing ideas. The basis of democracy is free discussion, and it is

---

[1]Franklyn S. Haiman, "Democratic Ethics and the Hidden Persuaders," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (December, 1958), pp. 385-392.

[2]Ibid.,

[3]Wilbur Schramm, Responsibility in Mass Communication (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 25.

believed that if all ideas are equally canvassed, men will have the opportunity of selecting aright to the dictates of reason and morality if they so desire. Modern propaganda, however, prohibits as far as possible the thought that there may be another side to the question than that being presented.

> . . . with the use of modern propaganda methods employing the media of the press, radio and television, the process of debate is circumscribed, relative to the number of people involved, to a degree never before seen in our democratic society . . . the problem takes on a new dimension when millions of people can be delivered up to one speaker on one occasion. To the side with the most money to buy the most favorable time goes the opportunity for the maximum saturation with its ideas with the least possibility of competition.[1]

A glaring example of this is the fact that in the 1956 election none of the major public relations firms would undertake the cause of the Democratic candidate.

> As one executive put it: "you see how it is. If a big agency took on the Democrat's account and the Democrats won, it would simply enrage Republican clients and drive them away. On the other hand, if it took them on and the Democrats lost, it wouldn't look too good for its selling ability." The public relations firms whose primary source of accounts is business, particularly "big business", are not impartial about whose side they are on in a political campaign.[2]

The issues presented in propaganda, whether it be the propaganda of the demagogue or that of the advertiser, are rarely the real ones. False or side issues are selected because of their impact and motivational value. Vance Packard's The Hidden Persuaders is a startling revelation of the unprincipled harnessing of depth psychology by advertisers in luring Americans into the greatest buying spree of all time.

---

[1]Nilsen, pp. 240-241.

[2]W. H. Hale, "The Politicians Try Victory Through Air Power," Reporter, XV (September, 1956), p. 20.

The author in his conclusion cites his own questionings regarding the ethical nature of the advertising he has described. He says:

> It is my feeling that a number of the practices and techniques I've cited here very definitely raise questions of a moral nature that should be faced by the persuaders and the public. For example:
>
> What is the morality of the practice of encouraging housewives to be nonrational and impulsive in buying the family food?
>
> What is the morality of playing upon hidden weaknesses and frailties--such as our anxieties, aggressive feelings, dread of nonconformity, and infantile hang-overs--to sell products? Specifically, what are the ethics of businesses that shape campaigns designed to thrive on these weaknesses they have diagnosed?
>
> What is the morality of manipulating small children even before they reach the age where they are legally responsible for their actions?
>
> What is the morality of treating voters like customers, and child customers seeking father images at that?
>
> What is the morality of exploiting our deepest sexual sensitivities and yearnings for commercial purposes?
>
> What is the morality of developing in the public an attitude of wastefulness toward national resources by encouraging the "psychological obsolescence" of products already in use?
>
> What is the morality of subordinating truth to cheerfulness in keeping the citizen posted on the state of his nation?[1]

May it suffice to say that these words represent the feelings of others besides Packard.

Characteristics of Modern Literature

Such a subject as suggested by this heading would require a volume of ample proportions to even begin to cover it adequately. We hope here merely to suggest the conclusions of some able students of literature which indicate the ethical impasse to which this branch of

---

[1]Packard, pp. 221-222.

communication has come. Such scholars suggest that the dominant conceptual myths of today's writers are (1) Voyage, (2) Hell, (3) Isolation, and (4) Doubt. All of these emphases, for example, are found in the following lines of Conrad Aiken:

> We need a theme? then let that be our theme:
> that we, poor grovellers between faith and doubt,
> the sun and north star lost, and compass out,
> the heart's weak engine all but stopped, the time
> timeless in this chaos of our wills--
> that we must ask a theme; something to think,
> something to say, between dawn and dark,
> something to hold to, something to love.[1]

This poem summarizes much of modern literature. It describes moderns as "poor grovellers between faith and doubt," and thousands upon thousands of current works reveal that authors and readers fit into this category. When Aiken refers to "the sun and north star lost, and compass out" he indicates the prevailing loss of direction and absolutes.

> . . . when the traditional premises regarding the radical significance of things have collapsed and when, therefore, there is no longer any robust common faith to orient the imaginative faculties of men with respect to the ultimate mysteries of existence--when, in other words, the basic presuppositions of a culture have become just yawning question-marks, then the literary artist is thrust upon a most desolate frontier indeed.[2]

In the award of the 1951 Nobel Prize for literature to Lagerkvist for his Barabbas we see a significant indication of the trend of the times. This story dramatizes, in the person of the released brigand, the problem of doubt. Barabbas is haunted by Christianity. He watches the death of Christ, and later mingles with the early Christians. From

---

[1]Conrad Aiken, Time in the Rock, cited by Nathan A. Scott Jr., p. 1.

[2]Scott, pp. 3-4.

the disciples he learns the gospel, but his mind and heart find no rest. He confesses to a Roman governor that he wants to believe but cannot. Lucien Maury, in his Preface to Barabbas, declares that in this book is expressed "the riddle of Man and his destiny, the contrasted aspects of his fundamental drama, and the cry of humanity in its death throes, bequeathing its spirit to the night. . . . Barabbas . . . embodies the emotional climate of our times."[1]

Modern literature frequently stresses the fact that mankind is adrift on a voyage to he knows not where. He is without compass, and despite the pressure of the crowds he is dreadfully alone. In his breast he carries hell, the torment of mingled aspirations and passions. And the primary cause for these characteristics of the literary picture is the loss of certainty regarding ethical values. Mankind is lost and knows it is so.

> . . . the language of imaginative literature is not the ethically and spiritually neutral jargon of any science: it is, rather a language which, if it is to do its proper work, needs to be heavily weighted with the beliefs and sentiments and valuations that are the deep source in the culture of its "hum and buzz of implication" and that bind the people together with ties that separate them from the people of other cultures.[2]

> "In the profoundest human sense," said Kenneth Burke in one of his early books, "one communicates in a weighted vocabulary in which the weightings are shared by one's group as a whole." But it is just at this point that modern culture has represented great privation. There is, in fact, little of anything at all of profound significance that is widely shared by modern men.[3]

It may be inquired whether an absence of ethical emphasis need be itself unethical. We would suggest that when the great mass of

---

[1]Par Lagerkvist, Barabbas (New York: Random House, 1951), pp. viii-ix.

[2]Scott, p. 5.

[3]Ibid., p. 6.

literature spends its emphases on uncertainty and doubt, the inevitable effect must be the disintegration of the already feeble ethical standards of many readers. To refuse to uphold morals is to oppose them. There can be no neutrality in moral issues. By standing in a "no-man's land" most modern authors have actually levelled weapons against traditional standards.

It is obvious to anyone who reads, that modern thinkers find themselves unable to assert with certainty that one mode of conduct is necessarily better than another. In the following lengthy reference Nathan A. Scott, of the University of Chicago, quotes and interprets the significant contention of Karl Mannheim regarding the causative factor of the ethical paralysis manifested in literature. This statement applies just as aptly to the breakdown in ethics in other forms of communication, including politics and advertising:

> In his important book Diagnosis of Our Time Karl Mannheim proposes the interesting and cogent hypothesis that the despiritualization of modern life is best understood in terms of the gradual evaporation in our period of authentic "paradigmatic experience" and of those great "primordial images or archetypes" which, being formed out of this kind of experience, have directed the human enterprise in the most genuinely creative moments of cultural history. By "paradigmatic experience" Dr. Mannheim means those "basic experiences which carry more weight than others, and which are unforgettable in comparison with others that are merely passing sensations." Without experiences of this kind, he says, "no consistent conduct, no character formation and no real human coexistence and co-operation are possible. Without them, our universe of discourse loses its articulation, conduct falls to pieces, and only disconnected bits of successful behaviour patterns and fragments of adjustment to an ever-changing environment remain." And his contention is that "paradigmatic experience," in so far as it yields some conviction as to what is radically significant, does also, in effect, yield a kind of "ontological hierarchy," in accordance with which we say, "'This is bad, this is good, this is better.'" But, of course, the whole drive of the positivistically oriented secularism of modern culture has been towards such "a neutralization of that

> ontological hierarchy in the world of experience" as encourages the belief that "one experience is as important as any other" and that the question of right or wrong is merely a question concerning the most efficient environmental adjustments. So the result has been the evaporation of those "primordial images" which objectify a people's faith and provide the moral imagination with its basic premises. And when there are no "paradigmatic experiences," then nothing is any longer revealed as having decisive importance, and men are ruled by a kind of "kaleidoscopic concept of life" which, in giving an equal significance to everything, does, in effect, attribute radical significance to nothing at all. In such an age, the individual is condemned to the awful prison of his own individuality, since nothing means the same thing to any broad segment of people--and the primary fact about the human community is disclosed as being the complete collapse of anything at all resembling genuine community.[1]

The transformation which has taken place in literature in the last half century is obvious when one reads the classics. To browse through Sophocles, Dante, Shakespeare, Jane Austen, Dickens, Scott, and their like is to be aware that their ages possessed cultures of vital unity wherein ethical agreement existed for the main part. In contrast the modern writer must invent for himself a system of values to interpret his world, and he has no assurance that his system will parallel that of any of his readers.

> . . . the writer has felt himself to be without a common background of reference by which his own imaginative faculties and those of his readers might be oriented and brought into a profound rapport with one another. So he has turned inward upon himself, pursuing a system of values or beliefs in the world of his own subjectivity.[2]

Writers such as James Joyce typify this modern subjectivity. A society has been formed which makes periodical trips to Dublin in search of scraps of information which might help in the interpretation of Joyce's complex writings.

---

[1]Scott, pp. 6-8.

[2]Ibid., p. 12.

Such a phenomenon manifests the continuance of a trend commenced by the effect of the Enlightenment upon literature. Coleridge, Wordsworth, Keats, and Shelley, the great English Romantics reflect in the wistful questioning of their poetry the unrest of spirit ushered in by the iconoclasm of the preceding century. The absolutes so long accepted by men seemed to be toppling from their pedestals. In our own day this tendency has been accelerated. Literature as a whole has received the stamp of Existentialism, not in the sense of theological assertion but with the meaning that existence is essentially problematic. This has molded art and music as well as literature.

> . . . when, as Paul Tillich says, "the nineteenth century came to an end" on the thirty-first of July, 1914, the existentialist experience ceased to be the experience of a sensitive minority and became the dominant experience of the age. In this century it has furnished the perspectives of the philosophic tradition that has been established by such thinkers as Berdyaev and Shestov and Heidegger and Jaspers and Sartre and Marcel; it is the experience that one feels in Stravinsky's Petrouchka, in Schoenberg's Pierrot Lunaire, in Alan Berg's Wozzeck, in Bartok's second Quartet, and in much of the great music of our time; and it is also the experience that has been painted into many of the canvases of such classic moderns as Picasso and Rouault and the early de Chirico or of such recent artists as Willem de Kooning and Jackson Pollock and Hans Hofmann.
>
> Now it is this strain of sensibility that is central in much of twentieth-century literature: it is what we recognize in such poets of verse as Rainer Maria Rilke and Hart Crane and Robert Penn Warren and Gottfried Benn and in such poets of the novel as Conrad and Kafka and Faulkner and Malraux. Indeed, as Lionel Trilling has remarked, "There is scarcely a great writer of our own day who has not addressed himself to the ontological crisis, who has not conceived of life as a struggle to be--not to live, but to be." And what one feels to be formative in much of the representative literature of our period is a deep need for a deep restoration of confidence in the stoutness and reliability and essential healthiness of the things of earth. The trauma that has been suffered is the trauma that is inflicted upon the imagination when it appears that both God and man are dead.[1]

---

[1]Scott, p. 25.

Nietzsche's lofty assumption of superior knowledge in his pronouncement that "God is dead" has had extensive influence. Men have come to regard life as a "tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, but signifying nothing." Life appears to such as "a dusty scuffle across a parched terrain," or as a mere "fuss in the mud" or "stir in the slime." The race is viewed as a temporary planetary eczema. The cry goes forth that humanity has been abandoned "in some blind lobby . . . or corridor of Time. And in that dark [there can be found] no thread."[1] Such pessimistic conviction of necessity spawns a literature that is unethical because it is inherently amoral. Sorokin refers to "the pathological bent in literature, painting and sculpture."

> In these fields the "heroes" are the Babbitts, the Elmer Gantrys, the warped and morbid characters of Hemingway and Steinback, Chekhov and Gorke, D'Annunzio, and the like, consisting of insane and criminal types, hypocrites, the disloyal, the wrecks and derelicts of humanity, interspersed here and there with mediocrities. The criminals and detectives of our "relaxation literature" and "thrillers" only serve to emphasize the point. In the field of drama most of the personages, as in Chekhov's, Gorki's, and O'Neill's works, are morbid, warped derelicts or downright criminals, or at best, sheer mediocrities. Even more striking are the pathology and vulgarity that prevail in our motion pictures. The main prescription of the typical scenario is very simple. A society girl falls in love with a gangster, which demonstrates that he is not a gangster but a hero. Or else the roles are reversed, a prostitute ensnaring a juvenile society "sucker". In the two cases the "moral" is much the same. Statistical studies show that from 70 to 80 percent of all cinema offerings concentrate on crime and sexual love.
>
> The same trend is exhibited by contemporary European and American paintings and sculpture.[2]

To sum up, contemporary art is primarily a museum of social and cultural pathology. It centers in the police morgue,

---

[1]Robert Penn Warren, Brother to Dragons, cited by Scott, p. 26.

[2]Sorokin, p. 66.

> the criminal's hide-out, and the sex organs, operating mainly on the level of the social sewers. If we are forced to accept it as a faithful representation of human society, then man and his culture must certainly forfeit our respect and admiration. In so far as it is an art of man's debasement and vilification, it is paving the way for its own downfall as a cultural value.[1]

We would now proceed to briefly trace the ethical course of history, indicating the possible causes for the decline in ethical values which is manifest in all aspects of communication today.

Most writers upon ethics have pointed out that what man does is always conditioned by his concept of what man is. Ethics are always based upon a world-view, a Weltanschauung. Thus it can be said that philosophy and theology have determined most systems of ethics. We would briefly trace the dominant concepts of the three great ages of civilization, the ancient, mediaeval and modern. This will enable us to see our age in perspective and perhaps suggest the fundamental causes of our present ethical breakdown.

> . . . the ancient mind, the medieval mind, the modern mind stand apart through a warfare of the intellect more than through force of muscle and sword. Each epoch is distinguished from the others by a diverse way of discerning facts and of assessing their importance. Peculiar to each is a genius, a certain homogeneity of outlook which requires a distinction between them. And the struggle of our moment, in the arena of world affairs, is not intelligible apart from this larger conflict of ideologies, whose broad outlines are exhibited to us in the great speculative divides of the history of ideas.[2]

When the distinctive values of an age crumble in the hearts of the contemporaries, the collapse of that age is at hand. Such proved true in the Hellenic world of the fourth century B.C. and again in the Roman Empire between the 3rd, and 5th centuries A.D.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 67.

[2] Henry, The Drift, pp. 11-12.

> . . . the present trouble represents the disintegration of the sensate form of Western culture and society, which emerged at the end of the twelfth century and gradually replaced the declining ideational form of medieval culture. For the past four centuries it has been dominant. In the period of its ascendancy and climax it created the most magnificent cultural values in most of the compartments of Western culture. During these centuries it wrote one of the most brilliant pages in human history. However, no finite form, either ideational or sensate, is eternal. Sooner or later it is bound to exhaust its creative abilities. When this moment comes, it begins to disintegrate and decline. So it has happened several times before, in the history of a number of the leading cultures of the past; and so it is happening now with our sensate form, which has apparently entered its decadent stage. Hence the magnitude of the crisis of our time.[1]

Sorokin believes that the three main supersystems of culture are the idealistic, ideational, and the sensate systems. By idealistic is meant that form of culture resulting from a synthesis of the knowledge that comes through reason and revelation, while the ideational culture is that based chiefly upon revelation, and the sensate is built predominantly upon the testimony of the senses. This author (Sorokin) suggests that the crisis of our age has resulted from a reversion to a sensate culture, and its denial of idealism.

> Any sensory value, as soon as it is put on a plane of relativistic and utilitarian convention, is bound to retrogress, becoming more and more relative, more and more conventional, until it reaches a stage of "atomization" in its relativism and of utter arbitrariness in its ever thinner and less universal conventionality. The final stage is bankruptcy. This is a brief summary of how and why the salt of sensate ethico-juridical values came to lose its savor. If the essence of moral and juridical values is utility and sensory happiness, then everyone has the right to pursue these values ad libitum. As pleasure, utility, and sensory happiness differ with different persons and groups, one is entitled to pursue them in the way one pleases and by any means at his disposal. As there is no limit to the expansion of sensory desires

---

[1]Sorokin, pp. 28-29.

> for sensory values, the available amount of these sensory values finally becomes insufficient to satisfy the desires and appetites of all the individuals and groups. The dearth of these values in turn, leads to a clash of individuals and groups. Under such circumstances the struggle is bound to become ever sharper, more intensive, and more diversified in its means and forms.[1]

While it is not possible neatly and precisely to place the jumbled philosophies of any age into a convenient single category it is possible to determine the chief bent of the dominant beliefs. The ancient world-view which we would here equate with the classical philosophy of the Graeco-Roman world was idealistic, the medieval world, through most of its course, ideational, while from the sixteenth century to the present, a sensate culture has predominated.

Another distinction between cultures should be made. The modern sensate age is naturalistic, denying supernaturalism and revelation, such a position regards man as in essence on a parity with other animals. But the preceding cultures (Graeco-Roman and Medieval) believed in the existence of a purposeful spiritual realm beyond the senses, and parallel with this belief was the concept that man was of a superior order to other creatures.

With these distinctions in mind let us glance separately at each of these periods and their accompanying system. First what shall we say of the ancient mind?

> Classic philosophy, the loftiest scaffolding for Graeco-Roman culture, was unambiguously idealistic. To the supernatural realm, the ancient mind in this influential expression assigned logical priority. Only in relation to an eternal, purposive, spiritual sphere are nature and man meaningful. Man is qualitatively superior to the animals because of this rational link to the supernatural; he is not merely a creature of time and space. Moral distinctions are objective and eternal, not merely relative and arbitrary.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 159.

[2] Henry, The Drift, p. 14.

Socrates, Plato and Aristotle offered a rebuttal to the earlier Greek naturalism of Democritus and the Sophists. With prolonged success the three giants dominated the Graeco-Roman culture. When the philosophy of Stoicism and Epicureanism gained a foothold, then the seeds of decay were sown for the collapse of a civilization.

The medieval world was the transformation by official Christianity of a previous shattered age. Men with the viewpoint of Augustine molded the chief characteristics of the Middle Ages. The Christians were in agreement with the Greek idealists in affirming the reality of the supernatural and the supremacy of man. There was a significant divergence, however, in their viewpoint concerning the nature of homo sapiens. The Christian revelation stressed that man was a fallen being, and to fail to take into account the noetic effect of sin was to miss the mark. Thus man from this standpoint is not now viewed as rationally competent in ethical areas unless aided by revelation.

> Nonetheless, there emerged in medieval times a distinctive culture, a synthesis in which the tensions of time and eternity were pointed for their resolution to the Biblical view of life. The segregation of medieval history, of medieval philosophy, of a medieval in contrast with the ancient and modern minds, is not a wholly artificial thing. No less than in our times, a certain way of discerning facts and of appraising their value and significance distinguished the medieval era, so that diversity of outlook and inner conflict was a phenomenon secondary to the basic intellectual temperament. The medieval genius worked itself out in a constructive spirit which, in contrast with the modern cultural disunity, creates constantly in subsequent centuries a longing for its reincarnation, even if in a purified form freed of the perversions of Roman ecclesiasticism. That synthesis was, in intent, theological rather than philosophical; it centered in the conviction that the self-revealing God had rescued mankind from both hell and pagan savagery.[1]

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

We live now in what many would call "the twilight" of the third system of culture, the modern period. This is a sensate age with emphasis upon naturalism, and with manifestation of widespread revolt against revelation and its implied spiritual realm. Beginning about 1650, man began to glimpse a wider universe than ever before contemplated. With the vision came an inferiority complex which was ready to accept the positivistic views which were the offspring of the mechanical interpretation of nature. The initial success of Newtonianism[1] seemed to explain the movements of the Inorganic, and men imagined that the actions of the human being could be explained on similar premises. With the eighteenth century came the Age of Reason, which predicated that man was naturally both rational and "good" and that education could usher in Utopia. Such beliefs were later furthered by the writings of Marx, Darwin, Nietzsche, and their kin. By the end of the nineteenth century almost every respected thinker believed in the Law of Progress.

> The central postulate of the modern mind, in its final expression, has been the ultimacy of nature.
>
> This central affirmation carries with it much else that is important. To declare that nature alone is the ultimate real, so that all reality takes its rise in and through differentiations of the natural world, is to declare at the same time that man is essentially an animal and that moral distinctions are only subjective and relative. It is to deny, that is, the reality of anything--gods, souls, values, or anything else--unsubject to time and change.
>
> By this central postulate, the modern mind places itself definitely over against the ancient and medieval minds. From the standpoint of both earlier views, when taken together, the distinctive modern prejudice is its denial of the reality of the supernatural.[2]

---

[1]It should be kept in mind that Newton and many other pioneers of the age of science were Christian in philosophy and believed in supernaturalism. Nevertheless, their discoveries were construed by later generations as demonstrating a mechanistic universe.

[2]Henry, The Drift, p. 41.

The modern notions that the world of nature is the primary reality and that man is to be explained on mechanistic premises, have undergirded much of prevailing education. In a $2500 award for educators only, the prize went to Professor Stace, author of The Destiny of Western Man. A prominent member of the committee who selected the winner was Carl Van Doren, who affirmed that this book was one of "world-wide significance, sure to clarify and fortify contemporary opinion and to leave its mark on years to come." Declared Stace in his book:

> "The Greeks, therefore, had in general no right to their belief that man is superior to the other animals. . . . And therefore we can not admit the validity of that argument in favor of the primacy of reason which bases itself upon man's superiority to the rest of creation."[1]

The implications as regarding ethics of such philosophy is obvious.

> . . . why strive at all, if the end of man is but a square meal for lower animals? Shall their welfare stimulate us to live honestly rather than dishonestly? Will it affect their diet any if we commit fornication or if we refrain from it? Will the maggots complain about their menu if we are plunged into an atom war?[2]

Strangely enough the full significance of the mechanistic philosophy, suggested in the preceding quotation, did not immediately come home to mankind. A liberal ethic prevailed until World War I. This liberal ethic, on the basis that the universe is run by rational laws, asserted that the moral life of society should also be governed by laws which can be discovered by the reason. Such laws of course were a very much watered-down version of the Christian ethic. Man believed that inasmuch

---

[1]Stace, The Destiny of Western Man, cited by Ana O'Neill, Ethics for the Atomic Age (Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1948), p. 52.

[2]Carnell, p. 333.

as man is essentially good, rational procedures will be followed once understood. Thus the great majority never understood all the implications of mechanism, or of evolution. Only a few, such as Nietzsche, carried these theories to their logical conclusion. It was after 1850 that it began to appear that "reason could be used to dethrone reason."

> Freud and his theories of psychoanalysis seemed to show that rational man was a figment of the imagination, and that man was governed by a set of irrational drives. Pavlov, Watson and others produced evidence which seemed to show that, even worse, man is merely a set of automatic conditioned reflexes. And, finally, developments in the field of subatomic physics seemed to shatter the very citadel of the liberal outlook, objective natural law.[1]

> The generation after 1900 was the last generation which lived in a calm belief in liberal ethics. That generation marked the twilight of liberalism though few realized it at the time. The basic assumptions of the liberal outlook were under attack by the ablest thinkers of the day. And, despite the social gospel, a slightly modified liberalism had been unable to cope with the underlying problems of the Age of the Machine.
>
> Liberal complacency was shattered, in Europe, by the first World War; and in America, by the great depression. Liberal ethics were regarded more and more as old-fashioned. In Italy, Germany, and Russia, liberalism was denounced as reactionary superstition as new faiths struggled for supremacy. By 1950, in Western Europe, the once-great liberal political parties were reduced to impotence, and liberal ethics regarded as Victorian nonsense.[2]

The idea of progress has been smashed, and also the concept of the natural goodness of man. Thus, since World War I particularly, there has been a breakdown in ethics. Some nations and communities have moved faster than others. Russia has incorporated amorality into her national scheme. Hitler and Mussolini did the same. The

---

[1]Dirk Jellema, "Ethics," Contemporary Evangelical Thought, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (New York: Channel Press, 1957), p. 117.

[2]Ibid.,

evidence reviewed in the first part of this paper indicate that even in America the trends are a startling repetition of the breakdown in ethical communication in Fascist, and Communist countries. The intelligentsia of 1960 is not sure that it can be sure about anything. If any god is to be worshipped, it is the god of science, but inasmuch as this god has now created issues which could result in the disintegration of the globe it is uncertain that even he should be adored as before. Because of this dilemna, some voices are to be heard asserting that we stand at the end of one age but on the threshold of another. For example Monsignor Fulton Sheen declares that "the signs of our times point to two inescapable truths: (1) we have come to the end of the post-Renaissance chapter of history which made man the measure of all things, and (2) we are at the end of a non-religious era of civilization."[1] Sorokin also looks for a new age to follow the recognition of the barrenness of our present sensate culture.[2]

If mankind is to emerge successfully from this present crisis, however, one fundamental question must first be answered, involving as it does the very crux of all ethical systems. This question has to do with the freedom of man. If mechanism and behaviorism speak the whole truth concerning man, then moral freedom is a delusion.

Informed writers in many areas have discussed in recent years the significance of the new developments in physics which have abolished the mechanistic view which sired Determinism. Gerald Heard briefly sums up the situation as follows:

> Not until Planck's and Einstein's work became accepted in this last half century was it possible for ordinary informed people

---

[1]Monsignor Fulton Sheen, "Signs of the Times," American Representative Speeches 1947, ed. by A. C. Baird.

[2]Sorokin, p. 324 passim.

to realize how 'constructional' the universe is, how largely it consists of only a mental supposition. As the intimate relationship of Time with Space began to be grasped the picture made by Descartes and finished off by Newton began to melt away. Thought and sensation came back as the basic experiences--not extension and mass. Man's freedom to act is, however, even more important than the discovery that he is on a scale that counts. It is here that the new cosmogony has changed our view point. Rigid causality, the dread of the moralist, the pride of the mechanist, has gone. How great that reaction to liberty actually is, how completely the old tyranny of necessitarianism has been undermined, still only experts seem aware and moralists, like animals too long held captive and close confined, do not seem able to step out of their cages, though the bars are shown to be only shadows. But when such an authority as Prof. A. March can say (Natur and Erkenntnis: die Welt in der Konstrukton die heutigen Physikers) "the individual phenomena are not subject to the law of causation though it applies to mass phenomena", we see that we have been living (if afraid to act on that liberating knowledge) in a world of lawful freedom, the precise environment required for moral behaviour. Law has returned to Probability and man is restored to the basis of morality, freedom of choice. These facts have been well publicised by Dr. Lecomte du Nouy in his Human Destiny and The Road to Reason. They have also been enlarged upon by Sir Edmund Whittaker in his Space and Spirit (The Donnellan Lecture, 1946).[1]

The progress in pure Physics has yielded many further remarkable finds that bear on morality--such as the estimated age of the Universe, showing that it had a definite beginning and, apparently, will have a definite end when its vast structure and span will contract and vanish and 'leave not a wrack behind.' It was created out of no material and it will, having achieved life and mind, cease to be. The supremely important point is that the study of the inorganic has established man's freedom, the essential postulate of his morality.[2]

The same writer sums up the results of modern research in the fields of Biology, Anthropology, and Psychology, pointing out that much has

---

[1]Gerald Heard, Morals Since 1900 (London: Andrew Dakers Ltd., 1950), pp. 162-163.

[2]Ibid., p. 163.

been demonstrated in these areas this century which refutes the nineteenth century concept of the universe.

Irving Langmuir speaks similarly when he declares that "the net result of modern principles of physics has been to wipe out almost completely the dogmas of causation."[1] He also asserts that there is "no justification whatever for science teaching that general causes (convergent phenomena) dominate in human affairs over the results of individual action (divergent phenomena)." "The mistaken emphasis of convergent phenomena in human affairs, and the reliance on so-called scientific methods has been responsible in large degree for much of the cynicism of the last few decades."[2]

Yet another writer says:

> Both Nevius and Hocking believe that the current shift in physics from the older Newtonian physics to the new relativity and atomic physics is seriously damaging to the naturalistic program. . . if the contentions of such men as H. Weyl, A. Compton, J. Jeans, W. Carr, A. Eddington, and F. Northrop are correct; then it is conceivable that fifty more years of science will see an abandonment of the naturalistic program itself by the scientists.[3]

Quotations could be multiplied to show that the belief in determinism rests on very shaky grounds and should shortly be laid to rest. The essential point, however, is that this bugaboo which seemed to menace the basis of morals, by questioning human freedom, has been dissipated. Here again, humanity has been slow as a whole to catch up on the implications of recent developments, and thus our prevalent chaos continues.

---

[1]Irving Langmuir, "Science, Common Sense, and Decency," Vital Speeches Vol. 9, 1942.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Bernard Ramm, Protestant Christian Evidences (Chicago: Moody Press, 1954), p. 58.

What then should be the standard of ethics in communication and other areas? Are we to agree with Bertrand Russell that "outside human desires there is no moral standard?"[1] Is there indeed any authoritative moral credo that can lift man beyond the level of the slave-pen, the stud farm, and the jungle? In reply we would suggest that if the lessons of history are read aright, we will no longer depend upon human reason to formulate a code of behavior. This has been tried and found wanting, just as certainly as the modern absence of any code at all has been found disastrous. Likewise the idealism of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle were found to lack the necessary dynamic to save civilization from disaster. What then remains? Some would suggest that what remains is that haughty man should acknowledge his insufficiency and glance afresh at the Biblical record of Divine Revelation, especially its Pauline form. As has been said by another--it is not the case that Christianity has been tried and found wanting, it has merely been found difficult and therefore not tried further. The race has been inoculated with such a small amount of the Gospel as now to appear almost immune to its real power. Nevertheless, if the power of love does not soon replace the contemporary love of power, mankind will be placed in that position where it will no longer need to concern itself further about ethics--or indeed anything else.

---

[1]Bertrand Russell, cited by Horace J. Bridges, Humanity on Trial (New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1941), p. 21.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is now our purpose to take a retrospective view of the past chapters, and then to set forth certain conclusions regarding the significance of this study for the field of rhetoric and public address.

In the first two chapters, which discussed the world of Paul's day including its rhetorical cast, we considered a milieu which was in many ways opposite to the phenomena manifested in the life and ideology of the Apostle. The world of Paul's day was the world of Classicism, which emphasized man's ability to organize and maintain an environment favorable to culture and happiness.[1] In the work of Augustus had been seen the culminating attempt to implement the philosophy of the ancient Greek aristocrats who believed that virtue and strength combined on man's part could create and perpetuate a Utopian society. Despite the great accomplishments of the Empire as it welded disparate people into comparative harmony, there were also threatening cracks in its facade. The popularity of Epicureanism, and the degeneration of most ancient philosophical schools, suggested that the character of most Romans was not calculated to bear successfully, or long, the burdens of Empire. Similarly, the eagerness with which multitudes accepted the Oriental mystery religions which offered them psychological escape indicated the same fact. Other evidences of the prevailing moral malaise included the weakened state of the

---

[1]The Classicism here referred to should not be confused with the special use of the term by teachers of rhetoric. Chapter I contains a description of the wider meaning of the Classicism mentioned above.

family as the individual unit of society, the casual and careless attitude towards the individual's right to exist, and the ennervating and brutalizing institution of slavery.

Rhetoric in this age, it was noted, reflected the contemporary pragmatism and lack of idealism which characterized the attitudes of the masses. As surely as the majority in the Empire fell short of the demands of Classical thought in general, so orators had ceased to respect the rhetorical standards of Aristotle, Isocrates, and Cicero. Paul's age was the age of the Second Sophistic, when oratory became the medium of giving effectiveness merely to a speaker, rather than to a message of truth. The canons of rhetoric had become reversed in order of importance, with delivery and style as the chief emphases. Invention was almost ignored, except as it existed in ready-to-hand forms. There no longer seemed to exist the compulsion of great themes demanding expression. Instead, orators devoted themselves to declamation as the means for displaying a dazzling array of verbal devices and oratorical tricks. In virtuosity, dilation, pattern, and elaboration of style are to be found the hallmarks of the prevailing rhetoric in the Empire.[1] These characteristics suggest the ethical vacuum which necessarily accompanied such theory and practice. Cicero's depiction of the virtuous and learned orator was regarded at this time as very much outmoded. Indeed, Quintilian's later emphasis upon "the good man skilled in speaking" was probably the result of his beholding of the reverse among orators during the first century A.D.

As we thus consider the deteriorated rhetoric and oratory of Paul's day, it should also be remembered that the tone of prevailing education was inevitably marred by this phenomenon. Ancient educational theory revolved around rhetoric, and the degeneration of the

---

[1]C. S. Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959), pp. 9-49.

latter guaranteed the subsequent depreciation of the former. Thus it remains as a matter of history that the age of the Second Sophistic extended even beyond the fall of the Empire, influencing for ill the system of medieval education.

With these facts in mind, it becomes apparent that Paul, in ideology and methodology, was an anomaly for his times. The religion he espoused cannot be equated with the contemporary Oriental religions because it transcended them in every way. It is only necessary to contrast the intellectual and moral content of Pauline theology with the emotional emphasis in such a moral worship as that of Dionysius to become aware of the great gulf between Christianity and the older cults. Similarly, the doctrines of Paul stand in direct opposition to Epicureanism and to Classicism. Love and reverence for Christ, rather than the love of pleasure and self, motivated the Apostle in all things, and characterized his teachings. In his concept of the nature of man and of the temporal element in which man moves, Paul was diametrically opposed to the tenets of Classicism. He believed that man by nature was depraved and was in every instance gravitating downwards to certain destruction unless Divine Grace should miraculously intervene. As for Time, the Apostle considered that this moved to the grand culmination of the Kingdom of God. Such a view was a bold antithesis to the pagan ideas concerning endless cycles and the reign of chance.

This distinctive ideology of Paul's inevitably issued in behavior and methodology which were likewise distinctive. In chapters three and four of this dissertation, the training, life and influence of the Apostle were briefly surveyed. Beyond all doubt, Paul synthesized in himself many of the elements of the Hellenistic world such as the cosmopolitan spirit; but over and beyond this was the dominant factor of his belief in a crucified Jewish malefactor as the Divine Son of God,

and Savior of the world. The Jewish Messianic hope had been Paul's inheritance, but it was the Christian realization of that hope which confronted him on the Damascus road with compelling and transforming power. While we may point to Tarsus, Jerusalem, and Rome as sources which contributed to the making of the Apostle to the Gentiles, it is the enigmatic and inexplicable experience of the Damascus Road which did most to mold and energize this unique figure. He believed himself henceforth to be Christ's man, called for the purpose of evangelizing the Gentile world, and inviolate from death or failure till his task should be completed. Whether or not we accept Paul's explanation of his call, the fulfillment of the commission espoused by him confronts us as a fact which has inevitably influenced our own daily experience in this world of the twentieth century. "Had it not been for Paul . . . no man would now remember Greek and Roman civilization."[1] More important still, had it not been for Paul, Christianity would never have taken root in the Western world as it did in the first two centuries of our era.

As we now survey the Apostle from our own age, it is his rhetorical accomplishments in the form of the New Testament epistles, rather than the record of his missionary accomplishments, which characterize him. Probably the former was responsible in great degree for the latter. While it is impossible to predict in matters of this sort, one is tempted to speculate whether Paul could have been as one-tenth successful in his task had he been other than an accomplished orator. Judging from the records of the book of Acts, it was the stirring eloquence of Paul which captured both pagans and Jews for Christ. Furthermore, it seems evident from the New Testament, that this

---

[1]W. M. Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, p. 53, cited by Wilbur Smith, Therefore Stand, p. 247.

same ability did much to hold together the tempted and tried communities of the early Church.

In our detailed analyses in chapter five of seven of Paul's written discourses, it was found that they fulfill to a large degree the lofty requirements of classical rhetoric. It is even more evident that they do not reflect the character of the oratory of the Second Sophistic. First place was given by Paul to the processes of invention. He is pre-eminently a logician if we understand this word in the context of rhetoric to mean one who competently marshals the evidence of probabilities. The epistle to the Galatians is the best example of Paul's habit of succinct and yet exhaustive reasoning, as a review of the analysis should make plain. The Apostle, however, is not an unemotional individual who thinks purely in logical terms. On the contrary he was admittedly guilty of often wearing "his heart on his sleeve," and of bringing emotional pressure to bear on his hearers. He argues from such emotions as his audience's love for him, and his love for them. The name of Christ, which inevitably conjured up strong religious feeling, is found stamped on every page dictated by the Apostle. Motivation derived from the Atonement of Calvary, the hope of the second advent, the reward of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked, is constantly employed by Paul. He dwells much on the centralities of existence, pain and pleasure, opposition and fellowship, punishment and reward, labor and rest, evil and good, death and life. Few of his arguments are solely philosophical, and they are nowhere merely tinctured with overtones derived from motives and emotions. Instead, the analyses reveal that the discussion almost always focuses on the realities of daily experience, and it is just as fully charged with feeling as these same experiences in every person's life. Thus in 1 Thessalonians Paul's purpose is to inspire the

bereaved with hope. He does so by appealing to Christ's own victory over death and His promised return to resurrect all who "sleep in Him." The Apostle does not leave the matter there, but with the genius of a pragmatist he asserts that such hope will inspire to constant diligence in daily duties rather than to a mystical withdrawal from the affairs of this present world.

He goes so far as to say that "if a man does not work, neither should he eat." Such an example as this from the discourses to the Thessalonians is typical of the Apostle's mingling of reason and emotion, of the ideal and the real. He nowhere considers it beneath him to discuss salvation and daily toil in the same breath.

A similar example of the linking of the theoretical and the practical was noted in 1 Corinthians, where Paul leads on naturally from his discussion of church divisions, immorality, and litigation, to a prismatic analysis of the virtue of love. While the themes of this discourse are pre-eminently practical, they are supported by arguments from lofty ideals. Because Christians are "the members of the body of Christ," they dare not lend their physical members to immorality. Because one day they will judge even the fallen angels, they ought here and now be able to judge adequately in temporal affairs without having resource to Gentile courts. Because the virtue of love transcended in value the "showy" talents, the Corinthians were to exercise courtesy and self-control in their church-services, rather than viewing such occasions as opportunities for display. These points illustrate the practical and effective motivation employed by Paul.

Ethos, the element of the third kind of classical proof, is interwoven in every Pauline message. It is its very warp and woof. The ethical appeal that is manifested by the Apostle's first epistle is

representative of that which is found in every subsequent discourse. The following lines thus become typical.

> For our appeal does not spring from error or uncleanness, nor is it made with guile; but just as we have been approved by God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, not to please men, but to please God who tests our hearts. For we never used either words of flattery, as you know, or a cloak for greed, as God is witness; nor did we seek glory from man . . . though we might have made demands as the apostles of Christ. But we were gentle among you, like a nurse taking care of her children. So, being affectionately desirous of you, we were ready to share with you not only the gospel of God but also our own selves, because you had become very dear to us. 1 Thess 2:3-8 RSV

It is not necessary or appropriate to review in detail the analyses of ethos made in chapter five, but it should be pointed out that the classical elements of competence, virtue, and good-will are present in abundant measure throughout each of the epistles discussed, as in the example just cited.

Only deliberate opponents of the Apostle required much convincing of the competence of this man, who was accused of "turning the world upside down." One who could silence a mob, almost convert a Roman governor, win both the aristocratic and the lowly, and raise up Christian congregations wherever he travelled, bore very evidently the hallmark of ability. Nevertheless, this element is to be found also as an essential verbal ingredient of the ethical proof of each epistle. Paul everywhere prefaces his message with the fact that he is an Apostle of God, and ambassador of heaven; and the authoritative note throughout his discourses is only the corollary of the competence which he displays in argument.

As for virtue, this also is everywhere evident. Paul nowhere hesitates to remind his hearers that he never enriched himself at their expense. He boasts of the fact that he would not accept financial support

from the believers although entitled to it. His transparent conduct is educed in answer to his traducers.

> We put no obstacle in any one's way, so that no fault may be found with our ministry, but as servants of God we commend ourselves in every way: through great endurance, in afflictions, hardships, calamities, beatings, imprisonments, tumults, labors, watching, hunger; by purity, knowledge, forbearance, kindness, the Holy Spirit, genuine love, truthful speech, and the power of God; with the weapons of righteousness for the right hand and for the left; in honor and dishonor, in ill repute and good repute. We are treated as impostors, and yet are true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as punished, and yet not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing everything. 2 Corinthians 6:3-10 RSV

The Christian counterpart of the Aristotelian goodwill is love. This Paul displayed in abundance, verbally as well as through other forms of conduct. Those whom he addresses are his "beloved," his "little children," his "joy and crown," his "brethren," his "very heart." He refers to himself as a nurse, a father, a mother, a friend, a brother, and as one wholly identified with the feelings and experiences of each believer, "weeping with those that weep" and "rejoicing with those that rejoice." Thus he declares to one congregation:

> I seek not yours, but you: for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved. 2 Cor 12:14, 15

Such references suggest that it is not difficult to find in Paul numerous examples of what Kenneth Burke calls "identification." The Apostle was well aware that by nature men are at odds with one another. By linking his destiny with that of every Christian, by throwing a cord of love about every congregation so as to encompass even the lowliest slave, Paul manifested an empathy that made men not only trust him, but ready to die for him.

In terms of the canon of arrangement, Paul is capable but by no means flawless. It has been noted that most of his letters follow a similar pattern of (1) the greeting, (2) the thanksgiving, (3) the doctrinal portion, (4) the section of practical application, (5) personal messages, and (6) the farewell. While there are inherent values in such an arrangement, linking as it does the present with both past and future, and uniting practice with theory, it has to be recognized that, particularly in sections three and four, Paul occasionally made progress by use of the zig-zag method. As his messages were dictated, his very fertility of thought proved at times an encumbrance. At times he seems to leave a thought unfinished while indulging in a lengthy parenthesis. Nevertheless, the more one studies the Paulines, the closer the relationships between such passages is often found to be.

While formal sequence is frequently lacking, there is present in each epistle either a logical or a psychological arrangement. In Galatians, for example, Paul defers his logical presentation of doctrine until his own authority has been strongly defended by a variety of arguments. Similarly, in first Corinthians, he was too wise to attempt to straighten out the backsliding church with reference to fundamental Christian beliefs until he had first striven to bring them to an attitude of repentance, humility, and receptivity. In Philemon was noted a psychological arrangement par excellence wherein the Apostle first strove to mollify the feelings of the slave-owner by a revelation of affection, and by a disclosure of the perilous plight resulting from his (the Apostle's) whole-hearted service for Christ. Only after such a commencement, and even then on the basis of friendship rather than authority, did he tactfully solicit the granting of his plea. These instances from the epistles are representative of the competent, though at times formally imperfect, disposition of the discourses analyzed.

In the chapter on Paul's style, it was pointed out that the basic requirements of a superior style--sublime living and transcendent inventive resources--were characteristic of the Apostle. From such springs came a distinctive form of utterance which conveyed the thoughts of the speaker with striking effectiveness. It is significant that the language employed by Paul was not the classical Greek of contemporary authors but, instead, the vernacular Koiné. Thus the epistles when first written had the same pungency and impact as is now reflected by such modern translations as Phillips' Letters to Young Churches. The Koiné Greek words used are those, which in the great majority of instances, were universally known. Paul's choices from among synonyms indicate his endeavor to be both precise and perspicuous. The selection of key terms such as agapē reveal a refined sense of propriety which refused to permit the sullying of an exalted theme by a word with vulgar connotations. Pathetic stress in the discourses was enhanced by a liberal use of figures, without, however, approaching the extremes practiced by his contemporaries. As for composition, Paul in some instances proved defective. Anacoluthon and ellipses are occasionally found. Despite the lessening of clarity thus occasioned, the overall impression of urgency and sincerity seemed thereby strengthened in a manner which no formal correctness of composition could have equalled. Finally, it can be said that passages such as 1 Corinthians 13; 15:51-55, and 2 Corinthians 6, reveal the height of Paul's stylistic genius, and place his ability in this regard beyond question.

In chapter seven, Paul's manifestation of ethos is compared with that recommended by recent American preaching theory. It is pointed out that most homileticians regard preaching as a distinctive form of oratory characterized by the principle that the preacher is an

accredited ambassador of heaven with a message based not on probabilities, but on the infallible premises of revelation. Furthermore, the preacher, as the representative of the Divine Being, is under greater obligation than the secular orator to express "truth through personality" and thus prepare and render his discourses with full recognition of the fact that preaching is "both an art and an incarnation." From the standpoint of the epistles surveyed, these modern homiletic concepts seem confirmed.[1] Paul was more than a secular orator. He was a spokesman for God. In this fact lies the explanation for the constant note of authority throughout his addresses. It seems also the case that the Apostle personally exemplified the virtues he proclaimed, and the procedures he advocated. If there is one characteristic in addition to his consecration to Christ that prevails above others, it is his love for his congregation--the same love that he so aptly portrayed in 1 Corinthians 13. For that division of oratory known as preaching, the moral is plain. Only the man who is dead to self dare assume the prophet's mantle.

The succeeding chapter on the relevance of Pauline ethics for modern communication emphasized that the ethics of each generation are always based upon a weltanschauung, a world-view. That is to say that conduct is determined by an individual's belief concerning the nature of his universe. If one discounts the supernatural, and views the present life purely in terms of mechanistic processes, then one logically lives according to selfish patterns. On the other hand, one who believes that the spirit of man is a spark from the Eternal will act as "ever in his great Taskmaster's eye." The tenor of current communication suggests a dearth of the latter kind of individuals, and the trend of

---

[1]As pointed out in chapter seven, it seems likely that the modern concepts of homiletics were drawn in large measure from the writings of Paul.

modern life reveals a crisis that has resulted from this lack. Thus may be seen the propriety of a new look at Pauline ethics by those leaders of society who influence the masses through the communication media.

Conclusions

What then should be our conclusions regarding Paul the orator? What does he have to contribute, if anything, to our modern theories of rhetoric and communication?

It has already been intimated in the summary that to appraise Paul by means of the classical canons is to rate him very highly. By the "methods" test, the Apostle emerges as a skilled artist apparently doing naturally that which multitudes of others have sought to accomplish by studied techniques. He justifies the rules of classical rhetoric which rules, as Quintilian, Augustine, Thomas Wilson, and others have declared "were made first by wisemen and not wisemen made by rules." By the "methods" system of appraisal our orator stands above and beyond any other recorded speaker for over a millenium of the Christian era.

If immediate "response is the key to oratory" and we measure the Apostle by this test, the verdict is the same. While it is not possible to trace in every case the immediate results of a particular message from the Apostle, those cases where it is possible so to do testify of his success. Internal evidence and tradition attest the positive results of 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, Philippians, and Philemon.

It has been suggested by rhetorical critics that:

> the societal point of view provides . . . the proper approach to the study of effectiveness. According to this conception, the success of oratory must be evaluated in terms, not of the speaker

> alone, but of the larger social sphere within which he functions. Thus the speech is studied in its possible relation to social change. This is a complex consideration necessitating a recognition of such factors as attitudes towards a change--conservatism, liberalism, and the like--the influence of tradition, and the power of the coercive authorities in the state.[1]

If then we consider the Apostle's oratory in this larger framework, the evidence is once more suggestive of his effectiveness. While the downfall of paganism and the official acceptance of Christianity in the fourth century cannot, on several counts, be entirely attributed to Paul, neither is it easy to conceive of such events as having transpired without his influence. One fact seems undeniable, and that is that the Western world is the result of the fusion of Christianity and Classicism, and this fusion was rendered possible through the energy, consecration, and skill of one who was an effective orator.

> It is a historical fact that European civilization received its chief content and strongest impulses from the ancient world. It is another historical fact that the most important legacies of the ancient world are those usually described as the Judaeo-Christian and the Greco-Roman traditions. . . . only by the combination of the two trends--a combination which greatly varied in character throughout the ages--was the continuity of European civilization guaranteed. Whatever section of its history we may try to investigate, we shall always find evidence of the heritage of Moses and the Prophets, and Jesus and the Christian Church on the one hand, and on the other, of Greek and Roman life, thought and belief, literature and art.[2]

The union here described between the two formative traditions of Christianity and the Greco-Roman Classical tradition was made possible by the Missionary to the Gentiles.

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, pp. 454-455.

[2]Victor Ehrenberg, Aspects of the Ancient World (New York: William Salloch, 1946), p. 240.

Second only to the "methods" test first mentioned, we would place that proposed by John Morley. He suggests that not merely the immediate, but the long range results are important. "Is not the highest object of our search in a study of the career of a conspicuous man an estimate of his contributions to the cause of the collective progress of mankind?"[1] Here is the test of service to, rather than mere influence upon, society as a guide to oratorical merit. How does Paul rank if considered by this standard? Our particular biases will determine our answer. If, however, we accept as an ethic that life is sacred and that whatever contributes to its long-range preservation is a good, then the influence of Paul looms large. As the promulgator of virtues which have ever acted as a preserving salt in society, he has had no equal among men. The influence of 1 Corinthians 13 alone has probably transcended by far the united best of all pagan oratory. Most reform movements, including the Methodist revival of the 18th century and the humanitarian enterprises of the nineteenth century, drew strength and inspiration from the ancient discourses of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

This test with reference to service to society has vital impingements upon the field of rhetoric and public address. Today the world seems imperilled by the potent propaganda of Communism, a propaganda which is empowered by certain rhetorical methods. An objective consideration of this type of oratory discloses that frequently its modus operandi has much in common with some aspects revealed by a superficial view of classical rhetoric. Donald Bryant suggests that reference to any speech handbook reveals the affinity between the methods of propaganda and the typical methods of the rhetoric of public

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 459.

address.[1] Of course he hastens to add that the former lacks the philosophic outlook which belongs to the classical viewpoint. "Most of the major propaganda techniques are long-known rhetorical techniques gone wrong," whereas oratory at its best fulfills the highest standards of morality and intellect. In other words, it is the ethical and intellectual emphases of the classical position which distinguish it from modern, unscrupulous, and highly emotive propaganda.

It is this point which is stressed by Barnet Baskerville in his review of Luthin's American Demagogues--Twentieth Century.

> The demagogue, says Dr. Luthin, is "a politician skilled in oratory, . . ."A politician skilled in oratory. These men who individually and collectively constitute a national disgrace were effective public speakers. They analyzed their audiences; they were masters of psychological and rhetorical techniques; they got results. Some, like Talmadge and Long, were outstanding school-boy orators. This should be a sobering thought to those of our profession who still insist upon making success the prime criterion of rhetorical excellence, and who disclaiming responsibility for the way in which techniques are to be employed, strive merely to impart to their students techniques which "work!". Such a philosophy can only provide another crop of candidates for such a rogues' gallery of unprincipled masters of the masses as Luthin presents in this book.[2] [emphasis his]

With this warning in mind we recall that the record of the Hellenistic era is that neither the Greeks nor the Romans possessed enough ethical ballast to provide equipoise for their intellectual endeavors. The hollow oratory of the Second Sophistic was indeed a mirror of the age. Such a civilization inevitably collapsed, and analysts of our times, such as Sorokin, suggest we live at the close of a similar era, facing the threat of a similar catastrophe.

---

[1]Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," Quarterly Journal of Speech XXXIX (December, 1953), p. 417.

[2]Barnet Baskerville, "Book Reviews," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLI (August, 1955), p. 180.

The historian Toynbee has expressed himself in the following grave manner:

> The secular philosophy on which most Westerns have been living, in practice, for the last 250 years is proving to be an inadequate guide in the new chapter of history into which we are now moving. If we are to keep our feet on the path of life in this next stage of our journey, we must be prepared to reorient our spiritual outlook, as actively as our forefathers acted when they put themselves through the last great spiritual revolution in the West at the close of the seventeenth century.
>
> This belief in science (to which our forefathers committed themselves in the late seventeenth century) has been the guiding inspiration of the West down to our own day, until at last its limitations and its weaknesses have been exposed as an ironical consequence of its dazzling success.
>
> The mastery of physical nature which this science has conferred on its practitioners is not just a feat of technological magic. Western technology and science originated as by-products of Western moral virtues, and they could never have come to fruition if these virtues had not begotten them. They are outward visible signs of inward spiritual graces: a devotion to truth that is prepared to follow an argument honestly, wherever it may lead; an ideal of integrity in workmanship; and, perhaps above all, a feeling of respect and charity for one's momentary opponent. . . .
>
> In our time, science has placed in human hands the power to destroy life on earth. . . . It has made the practical consequences of human conduct immensely more serious than they have been in the past . . . . two spiritual experiences are challenging us today. The first is, as we have seen, the spiritual requirement of a higher level of conduct that is being set us by the new heightening of our material power. The second is a demand upon us to make up our minds about our own fundamental beliefs; . . .[1]

If Christianity of the Pauline type does not contain the suggested ethical blueprint required to regenerate humanity, such a blueprint is probably nowhere available. We would suggest that the oratory of

---

[1]Cited by Rupert L. Cortright and George L. Hinds, Creative Discussion (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959), p. 291.

Paul, which was responsible for the rescue from moral shipwreck of thousands of lives during a degenerate age, contains principles and concepts which could empower responsible speakers today. For instance, every human being as one redeemed by Christ, was of worth in Paul's eyes. Such a concept, if grasped by the masses of the twentieth century, would prevent the growth of a totalitarian society and call for the universal extension of democracy. Paul believed in the power of love rather than the love of power, and his personal examplification of this virtue suggests that herein lies a dynamic that could transform and subsequently safeguard mankind. This same speaker employed emotion as a stimulus to the intellect rather than as a short-circuiting agency. Such an example followed today would purge both advertising and politics. For these reasons we would suggest that the fullest application of Morley's proposition to the work of Paul will be possible only when and if humanitysurvives what Sorokin calls "the crisis of our age," inasmuch as that survival seems dependent upon the application of the Christian ethic.

To these conclusions regarding the merit of this ancient orator should be added others with reference to possible contributions to modern methodology in rhetoric and communication. As intimated above in the discussion of the Morley proposition regarding service to society, Paul's chief contribution to rhetoric lies in his examplification of the Quintilian dictum that an orator is "a good man skilled in speaking." The discovery of new principles of truth is comparatively rare. Our great need seems to be the stimulus from new examples to believe and follow the trite but truthful platitudes of long ago.

Few men, if any, have spoken as affectively as Paul, because few have lived as sublimely. He helped to ennoble the world because his own life was first ennobled. We are reminded of Emerson's

declaration that in the final analysis the question which history will ask concerning each "great" man is--"Did he take the part of great principles, the side of humanity and justice, or the side of abuse, and oppression, and chaos?" Oratorical "mastery to Emerson was more than virtuosity. Mastery was achieved because of an inner rightness. 'A tone of authority cannot be taken without truths of authority. It is impossible to mimmick it . . . it proceeds directly from the perception of principles.'"[1]

> In one of his essays, after discussing the importance to the speaker of voice, language, and manner, he (Emerson) adds the inevitable and all-important proviso: "But I say, provided your cause is really honest. There is always the previous question: How came you on that side: your argument is ingenious, your language copious, your illustrations brilliant, but your major proposition palpably absurd. Will you establish a lie? You are a very elegant writer, but you can't write up what gravitates down."[2]

Since Plato wrote the Phaedrus, the best of men have acknowledged this principle that the chief requirements for communication are virtue and knowledge (including both the knowledge of truth and of method). Yet the verdict of history is that these two essentials have been adequately combined only on comparatively rare occasions. Generally it has been at a time of national collapse or the end of an era that this emphasis upon ethical and informed communication has been reiterated. An example of this is to be seen in the criticisms of "the great unknown" who used the pseudonym of Longinus during the era of the Second Sophistic. He inquires

---

[1]Baskerville, "Emerson as a Critic of Oratory," Southern Speech Journal, Vol. XVIII (March, 1953), pp. 150-162.

[2]Ibid.

> . . . why it is that, while there is today no dearth of men who are persuasive, interested in public affairs, shrewd, skillful, and certainly delightful speakers, our age so very rarely produces men of outstanding genius. A world-wide sterility of utterance has come upon our life.[1]

The cause proposed to this problem is that men are petty and ignoble because of their engrossment in the material things of life. Because few men lead sublime lives, therefore few orators attain to the heights of sublimity.

This writer expresses the philosophy that man was made for communion with realms beyond the visible and the sensuous.

> . . . nature judged man to be no lowly or ignoble creature when she brought us into this life and into the whole universe as into a great celebration, to be spectators of her whole performance and most ambitious actors. She implanted at once into our souls an invincible love for all that is great and more divine than ourselves. That is why the whole universe gives insufficient scope to man's power of contemplation and reflection, but his thoughts often pass beyond the boundaries of the surrounding world. Anyone who looks at life in all its aspects will see how far the remarkable, the great, and the beautiful predominate in all things, and he will soon understand to what end we have been born.[2]

In strong contrast to such an ideal the closing words of On the Sublime mourn over the fact that men of that generation were serving "the desires which surely rule our present world like an army of occupation and [which] drive absolutely everything before them."

> We are the slaves of money, which is an insatiable disease in us all, and also the slaves of pleasure; these two violate our lives and our persons. The love of gold is a disease which shrinks a man, and the love of pleasure is ignoble. . . . Little by little the corruption of life's circle is completed; great qualities of soul wither, waste away, and

---

[1]Longinus (?), On Great Writing (On the Sublime) trans. by M. A. Grube (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1957), 44.

[2]Ibid., 35.

> are no longer esteemed; and men come to admire what is mortal within them, for they have neglected the growth of the immortal.
>
> . . . the worst bane of all those born now is the indifference in which, with rare exceptions, all of us live, never laboring or undertaking anything for its own sake, but only for praise or pleasure, never for any benefit worthy of honor or emulation.[1]

Three centuries after "Longinus," Augustine made a similar plea as the thunder of Rome's fall echoed in his ears. He also affirmed that it was insufficient merely to master the techniques of public speaking. ". . . in causing his words to be persuasive, the life of a speaker has greater influence than any sublimity of eloquence, no matter how great it may be."[2]

And now in the twentieth century, as men contemplate the possible end of all things because man's moral progress has not matched his inventive genius, discerning observers plead anew for the ethical regeneration of mankind as the only way to survival, and indeed as the only excuse for existence.

> . . . it is imperative that ethics, which deals with ends and the relative values of what is achieved, be reunited with the political art. Rhetoric, as the intermediary between the will to action and the achievement of the result, must accordingly be conceived as both a political and an ethical instrument. This is another way of saying, perhaps, that there must be a moral principle supporting and guiding the liberal tradition. While there has been some disposition to resist the inclusion of such a principle in the scheme of learning--a circumstance resulting from our virtual deification of the so-called scientific spirit and method--its return as an active force in the field of knowledge is necessary. A sustained faith in democracy itself depends upon it.
>
> . . . . . .

---

[1] Ibid., 44

[2] Augustine, Christian Instruction, IV.27.

> So closely connected with the concept of a union of politics and rhetoric that it would be folly to dissociate them, is the wisdom of linking rhetoric with ethics. This is no new idea. The ancients recognized the necessity of doing precisely this. If man is a political animal; if he uses speech to achieve his ends in deliberative situations, he also needs a guiding ethic, a set of principles which will enable him to judge the right from the wrong and to govern his conduct by appeal to moral standards.
>
> This is simply another way of saying that rhetoric is to be used to give effectiveness to truth. . . .
>
> The issue is one involving the reconciliation of the instrumental means of acquiring responses from hearers with the ethical considerations relative to the character of the desired ends. It has been said that "the consciousness of end must be more than merely intellectual."[1]

This matter does not belong to the periphery of rhetoric. Instead it can be said truly that

> the central issue in modern speech education lies in the area of the ethics of rhetoric. The conception of rhetoric as simply a bag of tricks has been denied all the way from Plato's distrust of the Sophists to the modern distrust of Dale Carnegie. Yet the answer lies not in arguing that we must teach Speech as an "art," but in recognizing that the real difference between a defensible rhetoric and a modern sophistry can be delineated only through a fundamentally ethical criticism of the value-action connections which make up the real persuasion of a speech. Like the creative theorist in economics or political science, we can no longer leave ethics to the philosophy department.[2] (emphasis ours)

Many speech critics have asserted that "there is no honest rhetoric without a preceding dialectic."[3] The exemplification of an adequate value-system should be required of a public speaker.

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, pp. 467, 470-471.

[2]Croft,

[3]Plato in the Phaedrus urged the same procedure of initial dialectic. Inasmuch as dialectic itself is based upon philosophical concepts of reality and truth, the inevitable relationship between honest rhetoric and truth should be readily perceivable.

> . . . those who have been adjudged by literary standards to be the great novelists have not always adhered to conventional morality, and most literary critics would maintain that the personal morals of the artist are not a factor to be considered in judging the excellence of his work. However true this may be of belles-lettres, it is not necessarily applicable to the evaluation of oratory. A novel is a work of fine art, written primarily to be enjoyed for its own sake. A speech is an instrument for moving men's minds and influencing men's actions. As such, it cannot be amoral; it cannot escape an ethical compulsion. It must be remembered also that a speech is not merely a written document, but a dynamic process, in which the speaker as a person is inescapably involved. It does not seem irrelevant, therefore, to attempt to discover . . . what the speaker "stands for" and to examine the ultimate consequences of the course he advocates.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . there are times when the critic must speak out, lest he place himself in the ridiculous position of lauding the effective techniques of the latest demagogue and letting the matter stand, without pointing out the fatal flaws which render his virtuosity hollow and vicious. And though we lack certainty as to what is "true" or "good" in the particular case, we are not completely without touchstones for our judgments. However much we sometimes differ as to means, we can agree on certain fundamental ends. We believe in freedom; we believe in the sacredness of the human personality; we believe in the superiority of love, tolerance, and justice to hatred, bigotry and injustice. The suggestion is ventured, therefore, that we may find it wise and socially useful to supplement out criticism of a speaker's organization, style, delivery, proofs, etc., with Emerson's persistent inquiry: "Are you for man and for the good of man; or are you for the hurt and harm of man?" In these days when the consequences of acting according to our leaders' spoken exhortations may be either ultimate triumph or ultimate disaster for mankind, it is at least a possibility worth considering.[1]

The above writers, Baskerville, Weaver, Croft, Thonssen and Baird, are not professing to convey new information in these statements.

---

[1]Baskerville, "Emerson as a Critic of Oratory" Southern Speech Journal, Vol. XVIII (March, 1953), pp. 150-162.

Each is merely echoing in his own way words which were penned more than 2000 years ago, namely:

> It is not true, as some writers on the art maintain, that the probity of the speaker contributes nothing to his persuasiveness; on the contrary, we might almost affirm that his character is the most potent of all the means to persuasion.[1]

Aristotle declares what he believes is the case, while the later writers are affirming what they believe ought always to be the case.

Each of these quotations applies almost as strongly to the entire field of communication. The art of spreading ideas is far more questionable as to its ethics than as regards its techniques. In view of the fact that the average American now spends from three to six hours a day with mass communication, the urgency of making such an involvement profitable for society is obvious. Just as obviously, by "profitable to society" is not intended the mere material advancement which at this present time seems to augur more bane than blessing. If "talk" is to prevail over "take," and ballots over bullets, men must somehow be led to prize virtue above vanity and vice, and service rather than selfishness. Otherwise, our creed may become, "I believe in one uranium atom, divisible, with oblivion for all."[2]

Despite the fact that our generation seems to have an inferiority complex regarding the culture of the soul, the magnitude of the present world-crisis should cause us to question the current fashionable scepticism concerning the "old-fashioned" virtues. It may yet be found that the ancient absolutes recommended and practiced by Paul in his oratory are more relevant to our needs than the clever but too-often barren counsels of our modern communicators.

---

[1]Aristotle, The Rhetoric, 1:2.

[2]Reuben Gustavson, cited by W. Norwood Brigance, "1946 Year of Decision," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XXXIII (April, 1947), p. 132.

Possibly the Apostle to the Gentiles would say to us as he did to our European forefathers:

> Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true,
> whatsoever things are honest,
> whatsoever things are just,
> whatsoever things are pure,
> whatsoever things are lovely,
> whatsoever things are of good report;
> if there be any virtue,
> and if there be any praise,
> THINK ON THESE THINGS. . .
> and the God of peace shall be with you.
>
> Philippians 4:8, 9

APPENDIX

CONCLUSIONS *

It was the announced purpose of this study to investigate American Protestant literature in preaching, from 1870 to 1950:

(1) To determine the role and importance assigned to the Aristotelian concept of ethos;

(2) To determine whether or not in this body of literature the Aristotelian conception is significantly modified by the distinctive religious premises and purposes underlying preaching;

(3) and to report the nature and significance of such utilization or modifications of the concept.

The study was limited to books on preaching written by American Protestants in the period 1870-1950; the rationale of Aristotelian rhetoric was adopted as a means of organizing and reporting the data; the Aristotelian definition of ethos was broadened for purposes of research to include "any effects of the person of the speaker upon the hearer"; and an important principle of methodology in both research and report has been the search for motifs: "Those factors in virtue of which a particular outlook or system possesses its own peculiar character as distinct from all others".[1]

The purpose of this attempt to discover "the real motive force" of each system has been to clarify and explain similarities and differences between the two systems of ethical proof as adequately as possible.

---

[1]Nygren, op. cit., Vol. 1, Part 1, p. vii.

*This is the final chapter of John J. Rudin's dissertation "The Concept of Ethos in Late American Preaching."

Chapters have been devoted to reporting the views of the writers on preaching concerning:

(1) the nature and function of preaching and of authority;

(2) the nature and function of ethos in preaching;

(3) the sources of ethos in the two rhetorical systems;

(4) the nature and function of adaptation to the audience; and

(5) the role of the canons of rhetoric in the development and evincing of ethos.

This chapter will report the nature of the writings investigated; it will summarize the distinctive motifs of the two systems; and will assess the significance of the similarities and differences revealed by this study.

I. The Characteristics of the Literature

The number of writers who treat ethical proof is rather small. Of the approximately 300 volumes in the bibliography, approximately 100 contain references to the effect of the person of the preacher upon the hearer. Of these approximately 75 contain reasonably thorough treatment of this topic. The remainder of approximately 25 are brief allusions.

All of the approximately 60 authors who treat personal proof in some detail also discuss such subject-matter topics as the importance of preaching, the use of the Bible, the art of illustration, or other standard topoi.

Almost all those who discuss delivery refer at least briefly to the personal proof of the preacher.

The more than 200 volumes which do not treat the ethos of the preacher, are in most cases, devoted to topics other than the art of preaching. The theological bases of preaching, the importance of preaching as a Christian institution, the use of the Bible in preaching,

the type of preaching suitable for our day, the history of preaching, are topics represented.

Thus it may be said that the views of ethos reported in this study represent a comparatively small proportion of the literature on preaching of the period.

The majority of writers do not deny the importance or validity of personal proof: they ignore it. This is attributable in part to the subject-centeredness typical of the literature, which leads to comparative neglect of all topics related to the audience.

A second phenomenon is related to the first. No writer develops a rhetoric of preaching in which the Aristotelian ethos-concept is fully and systematically developed.

A number of the writers prior to 1910 refer to the concept, and several describe the Aristotelian qualities, but no writer applies the principle throughout the volume. Ethos is not viewed as related to the canons of rhetoric, audience-adaptation is neglected entirely or considered to be a means of adjusting the content of the sermon to the listener for clarity or for helpful ministry to his needs. The relation of speaker to subject is developed; the speaker-listener relationship is neglected by many.

Writers since approximately 1910 reveal little or no first-hand acquaintance with classical rhetoric.

Writers throughout the period incline toward concreteness and detail regarding the religious significance of the character of the preacher; they view character as a religious obligation; but they write only briefly, and in general terms, concerning the persuasive function of the preacher's ethos.

In a third characteristic there is practical unanimity among the writers. They consider the personal proof of the preacher to be a function of his personality as well as of his character.

Thus such elements of personality as health, vitality, appearance, manner, and delivery skills are viewed as reinforcing the effect of character-attributes. This is commonly expressed in Phillips Brooks' phrase: "Truth through personality", which is quoted by many later writers.

In a closely related emphasis the writers also agree. All view the preacher's qualities of ethos in a religious context, as aspects of his relation to God and to Jesus Christ, as religious obligations and possessions. "Preaching is both an art and an incarnation."

As a consequence of this view, several distinctively Christian qualities are regarded as vital. These include piety, humility, joy, respect for persons, and love. "The man must incarnate his Master."

Finally, these characteristics of the literature must be seen as manifestations of a yet more fundamental viewpoint, the primary motif which distinguishes preaching from Aristotelian rhetoric, and which gives it its "real motive force".

Preaching receives "its own peculiar character as distinct from all others", in the opinion of the writers, because it is prophetic utterance, because the preacher is a called and commissioned messenger of God, invested with authority, who proclaims a Word not his own. "The preacher is a channel, not a source."

In the light of this basic premise, the foregoing characteristics of the literature are seen to be aspects of a distinctive Godward orientation and a unique message-consciousness which distinguish preaching from Aristotelian rhetoric.

This fundamental motif likewise causes significant modifications of the Aristotelian ethos-concept.

The following summary-comparison of the two rhetorical systems reviews the fundamental premises and consequent theories of ethos which have been reported in earlier chapters.

II. The Distinctive Function of Character and Personality in Preaching

THE FUNCTION OF ETHOS IN ARISTOTELIAN RHETORIC

I. The Nature and Function of Rhetoric

A. Tradition, setting, subjects, and audience of Aristotelian rhetoric are secular, and ends--Expediency, Justice and Honor--are determined by the three speech-occasions.

B. No reference to religious speaking. Public functions of religion performed by Greek drama and temples.

C. Rhetoric is popular, does not deal with absolute or final truth, has no source of absolute authority, and is limited to the realm of probabilities.

D. Means of persuasion common to all three types of speech are enthymemes and examples. Thus the primary emphasis is upon arguments (proofs).

E. The deliberation and choices of speaker and listener have reference to means, rather than to ends, and choices reveal ethos.

F. This secular, proof-centered, democratic conception of setting, means, and ends produces the motif of rhetoric: "Discover the available means of persuasion, and persuade through arguments (proof)."

II. The Modes of Proof

A. The available means of persuasion are artistic and inartistic proofs.

Inartistic proofs are of less interest, because they already exist, are not invented by the speaker. Artistic proofs are the product of proper method.

B. There are three modes of proof:

Logos	Ethos	Pathos
Logical argument, as it demonstrates or appears to demonstrate	The effect on listener of the person or speaker	Affects in hearer concerning matters other than speaker.

Logos is principal mode; ethos and pathos are subsidiary but important. All three are proofs, and are effectuated through argument.

III. The Qualities of Ethos

The three qualities of ethos are

Practical Wisdom Virtue Goodwill

Practical wisdom and virtue are evinced by arguments from topoi of the praiseworthy, including intellectual and moral virtues: Practical Wisdom, Intellectual Wisdom, Liberality, Justice, Courage, Temperance, Magnanimity, Magnificence, and Gentleness.

Goodwill is evinced by arguments drawn from the topoi of friendship, which is treated as emotion of love (liking) and friendship.

Several of minor social virtues of Ethics are included, as well as several non-moral factors.

IV. The Sources of the Qualities of Ethos

A. The norms of the virtues are utility and benefits to the hearer, and popular morality.

The norms of goodwill are utility, congeniality and popular esteem.

Thus, the primary emphasis is the effect upon the audience, as judged by the audience.

B. Ethos is limited to the time of the speech-act, thus eliminating the effects of prior acquaintance and reputation.

C. The conception of ethos is a definitive but limited and partial emphasis, primarily upon Character. Although non-moral factors are included, such aspects of personality as attitudes, mood, empathy, health, are not included.

V. The Communication of Ethos

Ethos is manifested through Thought in Arguments.

The speaker's qualities of ethos, especially moral purpose, are revealed through his thought (dianoia) in the arguments of the speech. Since choices reveal ethos, his choices thus revealed are to be those appropriate to a man of competence, virtue, and goodwill.

Such Choices are Conditioned by

A. The ends of the three types of speech, Expediency, Justice, Honor, which are constants. The ends being constants, speaker and listener deliberate only about the means.

B. The ethe (customs, preferences, choices, norms) of audience, which are affected by hearer's age, form of government, fortune, wealth, power.

Such choices of the speaker are also conditioned by

C. The desirability of the speaker employing objective ethos (dramatic characterization). The speaker's ethos is enhanced when the traits of persons quoted and described in his speech conform to the traits of actual persons, as conditioned by age, sex, nationality, moral character, education, pursuits.

D. The canons of rhetoric are utilized by the speaker in the evincing of ethos.

Invention is of most importance; arrangement, style, and delivery aid in effectuating arguments. Delivery is minimized. All but invention are concessions to "the sorry nature of an audience". By making arguments clever and seemingly sincere and artless, they aid in the evincing of persuasive ethos. Memory is not treated.

THE FUNCTION OF CHARACTER AND PERSONALITY IN PREACHING

I. The Nature and Function of Preaching

A. Influenced by the Old and New Testaments, the tradition, subject matter, setting, and ends of preaching, are religious. Ends determined by occasion and audience, and also by purpose of God and authority of Gospel tradition.

B. Religious speaking is the chief and only type envisaged, and preaching is prophecy, witness of religious experience, and worship.

C. Preaching is popular, but the source and ground of authority is God, who supplies the message, calls and empowers the prophet--ambassador, and enables him to proclaim with authority. Subject-matter and ends are viewed as concerned with ultimate reality.

D. Preaching lacks this strong emphasis upon proofs and logic. Rather, the emphasis is upon content and proclamation of an authoritative Gospel, with exposition of the Word and tradition an important method.

E. No doctrine of choice as a revelation of character, but the religious choices of speaker and hearer are not limited to means. Rather, the ends of life and conduct are of utmost importance.

F. This religious, authoritarian conception of setting, means, and ends produces the motif of Christian preaching: "Proclaim the Word with authority."

II. The Modes of Proof

A. No mention of available means of persuasion, or of proofs.

The "given" nature of the Gospel, Bible, Word, and message favor inartistic proofs, already existing, ready for use by the speaker, revealed to him. This discourages a method-emphasis.

B. Christian rhetoric is not formally subdivided into three modes of proof, although there are emphasis upon content, and effect of the person of the speaker, and the emotional responses of the auditor. The respective functions are not clearly differentiated.

III. The Qualities of Character and Personality

No sharp tripartite division, and a greater number of qualities, which, with significant additions, roughly approximate Competence, Virtue, and Goodwill.

These qualities are related to the Aristotelian Competence:

Intelligence, education, self-discipline, expertness in the grace of God, objectivity, sense of humor, health, vitality, appearance, manner, speech-skills.

These qualities are related to the Aristotelian Virtue:

Piety, sincerity, integrity, humility, naturalness, lack of self-consciousness, enthusiasm, courage, perseverance.

These qualities are related to the Aristotelian Goodwill:

Winsomeness, joy, cheerfulness, patience, courtesy, respect of persons, friendliness, sympathy, love.

IV. The Sources of the Qualities of Personality and Character

A. A religious norm dictates nature of qualities and their possession. Preacher is obligated religiously and professionally to possess Christlike qualities consonant with the Gospel he proclaims. "Preaching is both an art and an incarnation."

Effect upon audience of qualities is a secondary emphasis.

B. Importance and effect of person of preacher are not limited to the sermon. His pastoral relations and leadership of public worship are viewed as significant corollaries of preaching.

C. The person of the preacher is viewed in a broader, less definitive manner, with important emphasis upon personality as well as character, and inclusion of attitudes and non-moral factors not treated by Aristotle.

V. The Communication of Personality and Character

Preaching is "truth through personality","an art and an incarnation." The preacher must possess Christian qualities, which will be revealed unconsciously as he speaks.

The truth, spoken by "the whole man to whole man", will minister to human needs and will persuade.

No doctrine of character revealed through choices. The Preacher does not consciously seek to reveal his own character.

A. No cognates of the three types of speech and the three ends. The speaker and hearer are not limited to deliberation about means. Rather, the ends and objects of life and action are of utmost importance, and are viewed as relating to eternal life, to reward and penalty.

B. Adaptation to the ethe of listeners is not developed. Rather, the subject-centered-message discourages adaptation to the preferences of the audience.

Adaptation is primarily of details of message to comprehension of audience, in order to minister to religious needs and to persuade. Acceptance of preacher by hearer aided by helpfulness of message and his evident love for the hearer. He will be tactful in treating "unpalatable truths".

Since qualities of character and personality are possessed, ethos and adaptation are not explicitly related. Persuasion viewed as "making truth effective", and as "truth through personality", rather than as evincing ethos.

C. No objective ethos.

D. The canons of rhetoric are not explicitly regarded as related to the evincing of persuasive ethos.

Earlier writers utilize canons in organization of books; later writers do not. Some writers throughout period refer to persuasiveness of matter and manner. Some are contributing to "the free interplay of personalities".

Accuracy, integrity in employment of illustrative materials, health, vitality, piety, sincerity, enthusiasm, interest in persons, patience, good-nature, and love are qualities most commonly cited as persuasive when revealed through matter and manner of speaker.

III. Significance of Study

A. The Significance of the Method Employed

The Author regards the value of the findings of this study as due in part to the method employed. By utilizing the Aristotelian rationale of rhetoric and of ethos, a functional emphasis was imparted to research, and report, and a detailed and valid norm was provided against which to compare and contrast Christian preaching.

This definiteness of rationale was made adaptable by the attempt to probe beneath the details of the rhetorical systems to the motifs--"the real motive forces"--which create the unique outlook of each system.

By virtue of this method it has been possible to gather data, to report them, and to interpret them systematically and sympathetically.

B. The Significance of Fundamental Motifs

The reported conceptions of preaching as a unique form of public address are regarded as significant, because they reveal a basic orientation fundamentally different from that of Aristotle, and it is the fundamental orientation of each rhetorical system which dictates more explicit details.

Thus the secular, democratic, audience-oriented rhetoric of Aristotle enunciates the fundamental motif: "Discover and utilize the available means of persuasion." In contrast, the religious, authoritarian, Word-centered message-motif of preaching is: "Proclaim the Word with authority."

This difference in basic premises, recognized by implication in such cognate studies as that by Casteel, causes the significant modifications of the ethos-concept reported in this study.

C. The Significance of the Nature and Role of Ethos

The findings of this study regarding the nature and function of ethos in preaching are of significance as they reveal important modifications of the Aristotelian concept.

The Aristotelian ethos appears as a narrow character-emphasis, fundamentally grounded in utility and benefits, and emphasizing those qualities persuasive in the speech-situations of Athens: Intellectual Competence, Virtue, and Goodwill.

The writers on preaching propound a broader view of Character and personality, in which "the whole man speaks to whole men", to reveal "truth through personality".

The preacher must incarnate the qualities of his Master, hence distinctively Christian qualities of piety, sincerity, humility, respect for persons, and love assume a significance unrealized in Aristotle's definitive but narrow ethos-construct.

In their conception of incarnated personality-qualities, the writers profoundly and significantly modify the Aristotelian ethos-concept.

D. The Significance of the Sources and Development of Ethos

The findings regarding views of the sources and development of ethos assume added importance because they contrast the two systems of thought at this vital point.

Aristotle's indefinite explanation of the sources of ethos as topoi and dianoia is starkly contrasted with the explicit and imperious Christian demand for incarnation of Christlike character and personality, in which even the "non-moral" factors are regarded as elements in the preacher's total consecration.

This study has revealed the Aristotelian source-motif to be: "Evince persuasive ethos through dianoia", and it has reported the source-motif of preaching to be: "The man must incarnate his Master." The second view is a profoundly significant modification of the first.

E. The Significance of Adaptation to the Audience and the Employment of the Canons of Rhetoric in Relation to Ethos

Because of the employment of Aristotelian rhetoric as a rationale, this study has focused attention upon the functions of adaptation to the audience and canons of rhetoric in the evincing of ethos.

The modifications of the Aristotelian methods viewpoint toward sincerity, artlessness, and ministry to human needs were seen to be characteristic of the Christian message, authority, and ministry-premises.

These subject-centered stereotypes were seen to predispose the minister to view adaptation, not as the evincing of ethos, but as an aid in adapting the message for helpful and persuasive ministry to human needs.

Similarly, these distinctively Christian subject-stereotypes were seen to modify the function of the canons of rhetoric, so that they become, not means for the evincing of persuasive ethos, but general means of effectuating the message, of "revealing truth through personality", and of aiding in "the free interplay of personalities".

In both adaptation and the employment of the canons of rhetoric, the revelation of respected qualities of ethos by the preacher would be unpremeditated, and therefore genuine and effective.

This study has unconsciously witnessed anew to the perennial significance of Aristotle's dictum that ". . . apart from the arguments in a speech, there are three things that gain our confidence, namely, intelligence, character, and good will."

On these pages have also appeared representatives of an equally seminal tradition, who unitedly witness that "preaching must be both an art and an incarnation."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allen, Frederick Lewis. Since Yesterday: The Nineteen Thirties in America. Toronto: Blue Ribbon Books, 1943.

Altheim, Franz. A History of Roman Religion. Translated by Harold Mattingly. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1938.

Angus, Joseph. The Bible Handbook. Revised by Samuel G. Green. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1952.

Aristotle. The Rhetoric. Translated by Lane Cooper. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932.

Augustine. Christian Instruction. Translated by John G. Gavigan, Vol. IV of The Fathers of the Church. Edited by Ludwig Schopp et al. 72 Vols. New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc., 1947.

Baldwin, Charles Sears. Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959.

_____. Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959.

Baird, A. C. (ed.) Representative American Speeches, 1946-1947. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1947.

Barlow, George. (ed.) Preacher's Homiletic Commentary. 32 Vols. London: Funk & Wagnall's Co. n.d.

Barrow, R. H. Slavery in the Roman Empire. New York: The Dial Press Inc., 1928.

Barry, Alfred. "The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians," Ellicotts Commentary on the Whole Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.

Bax, Ernest Belfort. A Handbook of the History of Philosophy. London: George Bell & Sons, 1886.

Berkhof, L. Paul the Missionary. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans-Sevensma Co., n.d.

Boak, Arthur E. R. A History of Rome to 565 A.D. 4th ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955.

Bridges, Horace J. Humanity on Trial. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1941.

Bryant, Donald C. (ed.) The Rhetorical Idiom. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958.

Burton, Ernest De Witt. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians of The International Critical Commentary. Edited by S. D. Driver et al. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1948.

Buttrick, George Arthur et al. (eds.) The Interpreters Bible: the Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for Each Book of the Bible. 12 volumes. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-1957.

Case, Shirley Jackson. The Evolution of Early Christianity. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Campbell, George. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1871.

Cartledge, Samuel A. A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1951.

Chakotin, Serge. The Rape of the Masses. London: Butler & Lenner Ltd., 1940.

Chase, F. H. (ed.) The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. [volumes not numbered] Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1913-1954.

Church, Alfred John and Brodribb, William Jackson. Translators. The Complete Works of Tacitus. New York: The Modern Library, 1942.

Cicero, De Oratore. Translated by J. S. Watson. London: Henry J. Bohn, 1855.

Clark, Donald Lemen. Rhetoric in Graeco-Roman Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Cochrane, Charles Norris. Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Copleston, Frederick. A History of Philosophy. Vol. I Greece and Rome [6 vols. in set] Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1953.

Cortright, Rupert L. and Hinds, George L. Creative Discussion. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959.

Craig, Clarence Tucker. "Introduction to the First Epistle to the Corinthians," Vol. X of The Interpreters Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-1957.

Deissman, Adolf Gustav. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. Translated by William E. Wilson. New York: Harper, 1957.

Dill, Samuel. Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius. London: Macmillan & Co., 1925.

Dinsmore, Charles Allen. The English Bible as Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1931.

Dostoyevsky, Fyodor. Crime and Punishment. New York: The Modern Library, Random House, Inc., 1950.

Driver, S. D. et al. (eds.) The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1910-1951.

Duchesne, Monsignor Louis. The Early History of the Christian Church (from its foundation to the end of the third century) New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920.

Duncan, George S. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, of The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt [no volume numbers] London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.

Eadie, John. Paul the Preacher. New York: R. Carter, 1860.

Ehrenberg, Victor. Aspects of the Ancient World. New York: William Salloch, 1946.

Ellicott, Charles John. (ed.) Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.

Eiselen, F. C. et al. (eds.) The Abingdon Bible Commentary. [a single vol. only] Nashville, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1929.

Eisenson, Jon. The Psychology of Speech. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938.

Farrar, F. W. Life and Work of Paul. London: Cassell & Company Ltd., 1908.

_____. The Messages of the Books. London: Macmillan & Co., 1884.

Fisher, George P. The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877.

_____. History of the Christian Church. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1887.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Life of Saint Paul: The Man and the Apostle. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.

Forsyth, P. T. Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1907.

Fowler, Henry Thatcher. The History and Literature of the New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1925.

Gavigan, John J. (tr.) "Christian Instruction," St. Augustine, Vol. IV of The Fathers of the Church, ed. Ludwig Schopp et al. 72 vols. New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc., 1947.

Genung, John Franklin. A Guidebook to the Biblical Literature. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1919.

Geiseman, Otto Albert Ferdinanc. "Paul's Method of Preaching the Gospel." Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, August, 1928.

Giordani, Igino. St. Paul Apostle and Martyr. Translated from the Italian by Mother Clelia Maranzana and Mother Paula Williamson. New York: Macmillan Co., 1946.

Glover, T. R. Paul of Tarsus. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1930.

_____. The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1932.

_____. The World of the New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931.

Godet, F. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by W. Affleck. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1899.

Grenier, Albert. The Roman Spirit in Religion, Thought, and Art. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1926.

Hackett, H. B. (ed.) William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1881.

Hamilton, Edith. The Greek Way to Western Civilization. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1959.

Heard, Gerald. Morals Since 1900. London: Andrew Dakers Ltd. 1950.

Henry, Carl F. H. Contemporary Evangelical Thought. New York: Channel Press, 1957.

_____. Christian Personal Ethics. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

_____. The Drift of Western Thought. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951.

Hitler, Adolf. Mein Kampf. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939.

The Holy Bible, King James Version. Oxford: The University Press.

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. Containing the Old and New Testaments. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1952.

Howson, John S. The Metaphors of St. Paul and Companions of St. Paul. [no place named] American Tract Society, 1871.

Hoyt, Arthur F. The Work of Preaching. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1905.

Innes, Kathleen E. The Bible as Literature. London: J. Cape, 1930.

Jacobs, Henry E. et al. Annotations on the Epistles of Paul to 1 Corinthians Chapters 7-16, II Corinthians and Galatians. Vol. VIII of The Lutheran Commentary. Edited by Henry E. Jacob, 12 vols. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1897.

Jacobs, Henry E. (ed.) The Lutheran Commentary. 12 vols. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1897.

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown. Commentary on the Whole Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.

Jefferson, C. E. The Character of Paul. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

Jellema, Dirk. "Ethics," Contemporary Evangelical Thought. Edited by Carl F. H. Henry. New York: Channel Press, 1957.

Kepler, Thomas S. Contemporary Thinking About Paul. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

Klein, Herbert. (ed.) The War for Men's Minds. Los Angeles: Los Angeles City College Press, 1940.

Kling, C. E. "The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians." Vol. XXI of Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students. Edited by Johanne Peter Lange et al. Translated from the German, and edited, with additions, by Philip Schaff et al. 25 vols. New York: Scribner & Sons Co., 1884-85.

Knox, John. Chapters in a Life of Paul. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946.

Kuist, Howard Tillman. The Pedagogy of St. Paul. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925.

Lagerkvist, Par. Barabbas. New York: Random House, 1951.

Lewin, Thomas. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. 4th edition revised. Vol. 2. London: George Bell & Sons, 1878.

Liddon, H. P. Essays and Addresses. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892.

Lietzmann, Hans. The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.

Lightfoot, J. B. Biblical Essays. London: Macmillan & Co., 1893.

_____. Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. London: Macmillan & Co., 1882.

Lindsay, Thomas M. A History of the Reformation. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Lipsky, Abram. John Wesley--A Portrait. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1928.

Longinus. On Great Writing (On the Sublime). Translated by G. M. A. Grube. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1957.

Luther, Martin. A Commentary on the St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, Based on Lectures Delivered at the University of Wittenberg in the Year 1531. Edited by Philip S. Watson, [no translator named]. London: J. Clarke, 1953.

Luthin, Reinhold Henry. American Demagogues: Twentieth Century. Boston: Beacon Press, 1954.

MacMunn, George. Slavery Through the Ages. London: Nicholson and Watson Ltd., 1938.

McClintock, John and Strong, James. Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. 10 vols. and 2 supplementary volumes. 1st Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1877.

Meyer, F. B. Paul a Servant of Jesus Christ. London: Morgan & Scott, n. d.

Mills, Glen E. Composing the Speech. New York: Prentice, Hall. 1952.

Montesquieu. Considerations on the Causes of the Granduer and Decadence of the Romans. Translated by Jehu Baker. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1882.

Moulton, Richard G. et al. The Bible as Literature, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., n. d.

Nilsson, Martin P. Imperial Rome. Translated by S. C. Richards. London: S. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1926.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and J. H. Robinson. A History of Israel. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.

O'Neill, Ana Maria, Ethics for the Atomic Age. Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1948.

Packard, Vance. The Hidden Persuaders. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1959.

Peabody, Francis Greenwood. The Apostle Paul and the Modern World. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926.

Phillips, J. B. Letters to Young Churches. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948.

Plummer, A. (ed.) The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, of series The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by F. H. Chase [volumes not numbered]. Cambridge: University Press, 1923.

Plumptre, E. H. "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians," Vol. VII of Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible. Edited by Charles John Ellicott. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.

Quintilian. Institutes of Oratory. Translated by J. S. Watson. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1903.

Quimby, Chester Warren. Paul for Everyone. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1946.

Ramm, Bernard. Protestant Christian Evidences. Chicago, Ill.: Moody Press, 1954.

Ramsay, William Mitchell. The Church in the Roman Empire. New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1893.

Rand, Edward Kennard. The Building of Eternal Rome. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.

Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, of The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Edited by S. D. Driver et al. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950.

Rudin, John G. "The Concept of Ethos in Late American Preaching." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Speech, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Russell, Bertrand. Mysticism and Logic. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1949.

Sanday, W. "The Epistle to the Galatians," Vol. VII of Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible. Edited by Charles John Ellicott, 8 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.

Schaff, Philip et al. (eds.) Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students. New York: Scribner & Sons Co., 1884-85.

Schmoller, Otto. "The Epistle to the Philippians," Vol. 22 Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. Edited by Philip Schaff, 25 vols. New York: Scribner & Sons Co., 1884-85.

Schopp, Ludwig (ed.) et al. The Fathers of the Church. 72 vols. New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc., 1947-1960.

Schramm, Wilbur. Responsibility in Mass Communication. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Scott, Nathan A. Jr. The Broken Center. New York: The National Council, 1959.

Sheen, Monsignor Fulton. "Signs of the Times," Representative American Speeches 1946-1947. Edited by A. C. Baird. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1947.

Short, John. "Exposition of First Corinthians," Vol. X of The Interpreter's Bible: The Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for Each Book of the Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-1957.

Smith, David. The Life and Letters of St. Paul. New York: Harper, n.d.

Smith, Wilbur M. Therefore Stand. Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1945.

Sorokin, Pitirim. A. The Crisis of Our Age. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1946.

Speer, Robert E. Paul, The All-Round Man. New York: Fleming and Revell, 1909.

Stalker, James. The Life of St. Paul. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.

Stevens, George B. The Pauline Theology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892.

Stamm, Raymond T. "Galatians," Vol. X. of The Interpreters Bible: The Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for Each Book of the Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al., 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-1957.

Starr, Chester G. Civilization and the Caesars: The Intellectual Revolution in the Roman Empire. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1954.

Sumner, J. B. Apostolical Preaching Considered in an Examination of St. Paul's Epistles. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1824.

Swain, Joseph Ward. The Ancient World. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Swensson, Carl Aaron. "Annotations on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians," Vol. VII of The Lutheran Commentary. Edited by Henry E. Jacobs. 12 vols. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1895-1898.

Tacitus. "A Dialogue on Oratory," The Complete Works of Tacitus. Translated by Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb. New York: The Modern Library, 1942.

Tholuck, A. Remarks on the Life, Character, and Style of the Apostle Paul. Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1840.

Thonssen, Lester (ed.) Selected Readings in Rhetoric and Public Speaking. New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1942.

Thonssen, Lester and Baird, Craig A. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.

Trench, Richard Chenevix. Synonyms of the New Testament. London: Macmillan & Co., 1880.

Van Loon, Hendrick W. The Story of Mankind. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1939.

Vincent, Marvin R. Philippians and Philemon [volumes not numbered], of The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: 1950.

Waddy, Lawrence. Pax Romana and World Peace. London: Chapman & Hall, 1950.

Walbank, F. W. The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West. London: Cobbett Press, 1946.

Weber, Alfred. History of Philosophy. Translated by Frank Thilby. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

Weinel, H. St. Paul--The Man and His Work. New York: Williams and Norgate, 1906.

White, Ellen G. The Acts of the Apostles. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1911.

Wild, Laura H. A Literary Guide to the Bible. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1922.

Willmott, Robert Aris. (ed.) The Works of George Herbert in Prose and Verse. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1857.

Windelband, W. A History of Philosophy. Translated by James H. Tufts. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1901.

Wood, C. T. (ed.) Life, Letters and Religion of St. Paul. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1949.

Wordsworth, Christopher. The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In the Original Greek with Introductions and Notes. 2 Vols. London: Rivingtons, 1872.

No Editor named: Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans. New York: The Century Company, 1925.

Journals and Articles

Baskerville, Barnet. "American Demagogues--Twentieth Century," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLI (August, 1955) 179-180.

_____. "Emerson as a Critic on Oratory," Southern Speech Journal, Vol. XVIII (March, 1953) 150-162.

Black, Edwin. "Plato's View of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (December, 1958) 361-374.

Brigance, W. Norwood. "1946 Year of Decision," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol.XXXIII (April, 1947) 127-133.

Bryant, Donald C. "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol.XXXIX (December, 1953) 401-424.

Croft, A. J. "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLII (October, 1956) 283-291.

Hale, W. H. "The Politicians Try Victory Through Air Power," Reporter, XV (September, 1956).

Haiman, Franklyn S. "Democratic Ethics and the Hidden Persuaders," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (December, 1958) 385-392.

Langmuir, Irving. "Science, Common Sense and Decency," Vital Speeches, Vol. IX (Jan. 15, 1943) 207-211.

Lee, Irving J. "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, VI, 1939, 66-86.

McClintock, John and Strong, James (eds.) "Interpretation," Vol. IV of Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature. lst Edition, 1880.

_____. "Paul," Vol. VII of Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature.

Miller, Clyde R. Propaganda Analysis, Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Vol. I, No. 2 (November, 1937) 1-3.

Murphy, Richard. "The Speech as a Literary Genre," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (April, 1958) 117-127.

Nilsen, Thomas R. "Free Speech, Persuasion, and the Democratic Process," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (October, 1958) 235-243.

Time. December 28, 1959.